

THE
CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

Nº V. OCTOBER 1876.

ART. I.—THE OPIUM TRADE WITH CHINA.

1. *The Friend of China.* The Organ of the Anglo-Oriental Society for the Suppression of the Opium Trade. (Published by King, Canada Buildings, King Street, Westminster, and by Partridge, Paternoster Row.)
2. *British Opium Policy, and its Results to India and China.* TURNER. (Published by Sampson Low, Marston & Co.)

THE Gazette and the Essay, which are named at the head of this article, are the publications of the Anglo-Oriental Society for the Suppression of the Opium Trade with China. They belong, therefore, to an avowedly propagandist literature, and must challenge the suspicions which are sure to greet all propagandism; but they are named here because they at least have the important significance, that an old and familiar scandal, long suspected, long shrugged out of court, has at last succeeded in making itself heard and felt in a definite and energetic shape. A Society has been formed, which has resolved to see the scandal through; a literature has been started, which is determined to secure a sifting of the charge against England. The question, then, is not to be repressed; it is gaining, not losing, life; it is coming forward publicly in the House of Commons, and in the press. It may be well for all men to consider what they are going to do in this matter.

It may be that some people will be surprised to see the introduction of a subject such as the Opium Trade with China into the pages of a Church Review. It has become so easy for us to separate Church and State in idea, so natural to

disestablish the Church from any place in our public and political language, that we are almost startled now by any juxtaposition of religion and politics. Any hint that Christianity has a distinct bearing on the question of whether this or that Bill should be passed, confuses and distresses us. We hardly know what to make of it. Ordinary economical, monetary, commercial grounds—these we understand at once; the problems of private or public convenience—these we can discuss readily and at our ease: but the sudden introduction of this old ghost of religion into the question—this, in our public capacity, is what bothers and paralyses us. We fume and fret like *The Times* when the Bishop of Winchester considers that the Divine authority of Bishops has its bearings upon the machinery of the Public Worship Bill; we smile or grow restless, as the House of Commons does, when the Book of Genesis is brought in to decide on the lawfulness of marrying our deceased wives' sisters. This has happened to most of us; and it is just because it has happened, that this paper is written. It is written with the definite object of forcing forward these questions: Are there not certain public problems, involving, it may be, large financial and political considerations, about which, whatever policy may have to say, a Christian can be allowed to have but one opinion? If so, is not he bound to make this opinion, which he holds by virtue of the very character and authority of his faith, be felt as a distinct and public fact, as a real working motive, on which he votes, and speaks, and acts in the open daylight of the political world? These are the general questions involved: and it is in view of them that we would ask more particularly whether the opium trade with China be not a case most terribly in point.

The general questions of which we speak are eminently important, because they lie close to certain especial perils—perils which perhaps afflict and endanger Englishmen above all other nations. Englishmen have a natural horror of ideas as such, of abstractions—a horror, a shrinking which reach their height in the typical product of the English genius, the House of Commons; and yet the whole tendency of the House and of the people is, in their abject dread of ideal abstractions, to fly to others that they know not of, and to take refuge in *practical* abstractions. 'This is not, let me assure the House, a mere theory,' say the honourable Members; 'it is a matter of practice, of experience, of facts:' as if, indeed, facts and experience and practice were not just as much abstractions, as theory, or principle, or law. Any

honourable Member who attempts to look at facts by themselves, at practice by itself, is performing an analysis of life, and abstracting one element in it from another, just as much as any one of those philosophers do, whose 'nostrums' he abhors. He is forming, let us assure him, however surprising it may seem, an 'ideal' conception of things in his own sense of ideal, that is, he is picturing things as other than they really are. For, the moment we think at all, we see that facts never really exist apart from law, practice apart from theory, experience apart from principle. Our honourable Member has therefore accomplished a distinct feat of abstraction by opposing any one element of these pairs to the other: he is using abstractions without knowing it; and the peculiar moral peril which he runs (in contrast with the peril of a vain and selfish and egotistical enthusiasm which attacks the man who abstracts ideas from facts), is, that, by attempting to abstract facts from ideas, to be practical without being theoretical, he falls into a practice which has no regard for principle. Facts crowd and press about him: he has to adapt himself to them, to modify this by that, and that by this, to squeeze himself in between them, as well as he can, to compromise. He spends his whole life in this process of self-adaptation to external facts, and so long as the facts happen to be good and right facts, so long this self-adaptation is a good and true process of self-discipline. There can be no better training in humility, in control, in temperance, in love, even; but there is this danger about it, that, when once the facts are wrong and evil facts, he is apt to be utterly ignorant of their wrongness, having no clear canon of right, by which to test, and prove, and justify them, and yet is just as resolute to squeeze himself into consistency with them as he has done so often before under happier conditions.

For instance, under the dominion of good facts more or less, the Englishman has made for himself, by constant and careful pinching and squeezing and pressing, a capital political constitution, and has moulded his own instincts into first-rate political organs; but, if we suppose that he finds himself in the presence of a vast and solid array of commercial conditions, which are only too apt to be of doubtful moral character, then there is a tremendous danger of his advancing to meet them in the pride of that capacity for political compromise on which he has so justly vaunted himself in his home history, but which means here, in these bad conditions, not the capacity for adapting and submitting self to the control and measure of a higher law, governing both himself and the facts,

but a capacity for rapid submission to sin, a capacity for ready compromise and complicity with evil.

Now in these latter days this capacity of his, which is already an Englishman's traditional boast, and which is therefore confident in its own rightness, and eager to show its power on new fields, has had a tool of peculiar aptness and brilliancy put into its hands. A science has been made of those economical relations, those commercial conditions of which we have spoken—a science excellent and true in itself, but, like all other empirical sciences, partial, abstract, unresolved into first principles. Political Economy abstracts the conditions of wealth from all other conditions, and then classifies, methodises, arranges them. This is all very good and useful; but it is only too liable to chime in with an Englishman's habitual failing. Because it is a science which deals with practical subjects, with facts of daily common life, an Englishman fancies it to be what *he* calls practical; *i.e.* not a science at all, but a sure determinant of practice. It seems to him to be no speculative method of analysis, but to tell him how things really are; and he fancies that, if he can act in view of these economical relations and facts, he is dealing with life as it really is, which it is his pride to profess to do, and that therefore these economical facts are the especial facts into the shape and mould of which he is now to prove how quickly and triumphantly an Englishman can squeeze himself.

But there are no such facts actually existent. The facts which he seems to himself to see are nothing but certain commercial or social relations of things to one another, artificially and unreally abstracted from all those moral, national, personal, spiritual, religious relations with which they are essentially interwoven. A particular science is quite right to confine itself to particular relations; but action, as the Englishman well knows, must deal with things as they exist, and there is no such thing in existence as a commercial world determined by none but commercial considerations. To act as if there were, is at once to go wrong: for it is an attempt to act as if you yourself were merely an abstraction and could act as nothing but a money-making animal, without regard to all else that you may be, though action always must involve in itself the whole concrete complex man. To act in sole obedience to the conditions of commerce is to act wrongly, for it is to act without regard to all national, political, moral, spiritual, religious considerations. It is to bring yourself into collision with facts, inasmuch as you are acting in view of a

mere dream-world, the creature of your own fancy, and not in view of the actual, solid, concrete earth which we live in.

This is our peril ; and it lays upon us Christians a singular and characteristic duty. As Christians, we live by sheer force of principle : we may never for a moment desert the standpoint of idea, of law, and of theory. We deal, indeed, with facts as they are ; we claim to inherit and dominate the earth : but we profess, on the authority of our first charter, the Sermon on the Mount, that the true secret of how to understand fact, how to 'find yourself' on earth, is to hold tight to the single law which imperiously governs all the multitude of facts, to the unity of God, on whose absolute Will the world hangs. It is right to submit ourselves to the law, the will seen in and through the facts, but never to the facts by themselves, to facts conceived of in divorce from this single supremacy. To isolate ourselves from this first principle is to isolate ourselves from our very life. Empirical science, which necessarily abstracts, is, as we say, quite right to isolate one set of conditions from another : but we cannot *act* upon conditions thus artificially isolated, for in action we ourselves exhibit our life, and our life lies in our union with this one supreme Will.

As a Christian Church, then, we are bound to recall mankind to the remembrance of *all* the conditions which determine action, whenever we act, whether politically, or commercially, or socially.

As a National Church, we exist in order to recall Englishmen, to recall ourselves as Englishmen, from the risks and falls which beset the national ways of living and thinking.

As an Establishment, we are, as it were, appealed to by the nation itself to guard it against itself. We are set up on purpose to emphasise, at all times, and in all places of its civil and public existence, its Christian profession, and to remind it continually of the spiritual domain, to cry to it unceasingly, 'Remember, commerce is not your life.' We are officially appointed to keep the people's conscience alive to its chosen principles : and we are guilty, therefore, as Churchmen, of a failure of duty, if we do not send forth a loud and searching voice, that may be heard sounding, like a trumpet, above the turmoil and disorder of this bustling business of perpetual commerce, crying, with something of the piercing vigour, the thrilling persistence of a prophetic utterance, to those whose eyes are blinded and whose ears are deafened, and whose backs are bowed—'Lift, lift thine eyes to the hills, the hills from which alone cometh help.'

If this is so, if we are indeed the keepers of the nation's

conscience, the cleansers of her temple, the prophets of her spiritual faith, then we cannot see why we should be stopped from our loud crying, because there may be a crowd of practical difficulties hampering our movements, because a swarm of commercial, of financial, of political considerations, rise round us, like gnats, and buzz and sting the moment we attempt to step forward. Let the statesmen look to these : it is their duty, their privilege : but, nevertheless, let us, as Churchmen, say as persistently as ever : ' It is just because of this swarm of practical difficulties that we must keep on crying all the louder and all the stronger. These are just the difficulties which trammel us when once we try to live by commercial considerations ; and therefore we must proclaim the counter principle. We must keep on saying that this or that is absolutely evil ; that this or that is not to be done ; that we may not acquiesce in it ; that we, as English Churchmen, irrevocably condemn it. It is for you, who are statesmen, who are honourable Members, and not for us, to find the way out of the wood : it would be presumption in us to dictate to you the road : but stop here, where we are, we, as a Christian people, dare not for our lives.'

Might not the Church do this ? Ought it not to do it ? Has it not been a real reproach to the Church of the last three centuries in England that it has so rarely lifted up its voice against *public* abuses, against national sins ? It has laboured hard at repressing private vices, at renovating personal characters : but how often has it boldly rebuked vice in high places ? How often has it set its heel on a large nest of social wickedness ? How often discovered and condemned a whole by-world of common iniquity ? How often has it played the part of a Hercules, who cleanses Augean stables, who recovers to order a whole tract of desolate morass ? Yet, surely, the words of the Lord are ringing about the ears of this Church's chiefs : ' Behold, I have this day set thee over the nations and over the kingdoms, to root out, and to pull down, and to destroy, and to throw down, to build and to plant.'

As a National Church, it is bound to be a factor in the large and national life, proclaiming incessantly the impossibility of any final severance between political and religious considerations ; and must there not, then, be certain public questions of policy in the matter of which it ought to be an accepted and acknowledged fact, in public life, that the entire judgment and influence of the Church, as a single corporate body, were set in one direction, were pledged to a single

course, were resolute in supporting a single object without doubt or scruple, in much the same way as the whole Evangelical judgment and influence stood publicly pledged to the abolition of the slave-trade? Then indeed, if it were so, Parliament might know on what force it could count, in passing a measure; then statesmen might indeed go forward to settle a matter, with confidence, with decision, with the security of sure support. So much for the general subject: and now the inquiry comes, Is there not one question, at least, on which the Church's duty would be clear, on which her voice might pronounce a sure and irresistible verdict? Let us think over the main facts of the history of our Opium commerce with China.

First, then, let us look at China itself, in order that we may know what is the state of things which we are proposing to consider in its bearings upon English policy. It is a very old story, but, as long as the subject of it remains unchanged, it is well to keep on dinning it in our careless ears, stamping it down into our light and shifting hearts. Briefly put, the facts are these.

The Chinese are, as a people, opium-smokers, and have by opium reduced themselves to a condition worse, by all accounts, than anything which we can see, in our streets at home, of the results of drink.

'It is to me vain,' says Sir Thomas Wade, Her Majesty's Ambassador in Pekin, in a memorandum to the Government, 'to think otherwise of the use of the drug in China than as of a habit many times more pernicious, naturally speaking, than the gin and whisky drinking which we deplore at home. It takes possession more insidiously, and keeps its hold to the full as tenaciously. I know no case of radical cure. It has ensured, in every case within my knowledge, the steady descent, moral and physical, of the smoker. There is reason to fear that a higher class than used to smoke in Commissioner Lin's day are now taking to the practice.'

"Do you think," a Select Committee of the House of Commons asks Mr. T. T. Cooper, "from your own experience in travelling in China and investigating these matters, that the use of opium there causes as much public injury as the consumption of drink in England?"—"Yes; I think that the effects of opium in China are worse than the effects of drink in England, as far as my experience goes."

That is the sort of evidence which at once puts us straight. We know what drinking at home is; we are ourselves aghast at its horrors; we find it difficult to keep our heads cool when we reflect upon its deeds: and then we are certified that, on the whole, the use of opium in China is even worse. After this, it is hardly necessary to discuss the contradictions that

travellers level against each other on this point. It is quite true that not every one who takes opium is utterly ruined by it. Again it is quite true that the actual effects of opium on the smoker, at the time of indulging, are not always outrageous and violent. 'It does not cause the amount of crime that we suffer from at home in the case of drink.' So Mr. Cooper owns.

'As long as a man takes his opium regularly, he may not feel anything of harm for a long time; but if he loses his supply of opium on Monday, on Tuesday morning he will be ruined for work all the rest of the week, he will not pick up again. If he does not get some soon he will die. . . . In the more populous parts, generally after starting on my journey early in the morning, through the suburbs of the town, it is a very common thing to see half-naked men lying dead from want of opium.'

And in *this* way it does lead to constant crime. Its use does not lead men to murder, as drink does with us at home: but 'men will do anything to get opium: they will sell for this their children, their wives, their mothers, their fathers.'

So it is, that the Chinese ballads describe the utter abandonment of all moral principle which marks the opium smoker. So it is that the public voice condemns it, as we condemn gambling. For a man to be a confirmed smoker is to be traditionally ruined.

So it is that the English Churches refuse to admit opium-smokers. The general condemnation is not the less strong, because the habit is so general: the ruined smokers themselves do not seem to defend themselves; the miserable creatures are eager to confess their own pitiful madness to those who visit the sad dens. What we seem to have here before us is the spectacle of a whole nation entangled more or less helplessly in the snare of that which is, to it itself, the symbol of corruption, and ruin, and immorality. It is known to all as 'the foreign poison.' It is impossible to estimate the loss of moral force to a nation, in living habitually and as a whole below its own moral standard.

What it comes to in the worser use of the drug is this:—

'The continuance of the practice deteriorates the physical constitution and moral character of the individual. Its powerful effects are manifested by stupor, forgetfulness, deterioration of the mental faculties, emaciation, debility, sallowness, lividity of eyelids and lips, appetite destroyed or depraved. In the morning these creatures have a most wretched appearance, evincing no symptoms of having been refreshed by sleep; there is a burning in the throat; if the dose be

not taken at the usual time, there is prostration, vertigo, torpor, discharge of water from the eyes. If the privation be complete, then there is coldness over all the body, with aching. Diarrhoea occurs, and if the poison be withheld, death. . . . 'The offspring of opium-smokers are weak, stunted, and decrepit.'

It is difficult to gather from the accounts to what numbers this description will apply ; but obviously the cases are quite common. The subtler effects upon the upper classes may be gathered from De Quincey's well-known *Confessions*—that book of doubtful fame, which illustrates so vividly the failings in defence of which it pleads, the loss of will, of moral nerve, of moral force, of intellectual reality, of spiritual muscle, of all solidity of mind, of all rigidity of principle, the laziness of soul, the vague sense of disaster, which cripples, and unhinges, and enfeebles the whole man ; to whom real outward earnest life has become as sand that he cannot bind or hold, as water that slips away through his fingers in the swift changes of an uneasy dream. With all men, in short, the use of opium is never in the direction of good, but always *towards* deterioration, always *towards* ruin, ruin that affects mind as well as body ; and yet its use in China is so general that we are assured that a third of the population would die of privation if the supplies were cut off.

This, then, is the absolutely certain state of things : it requires no parade or exaggeration of the evidence to exhibit it as terrible. Two questions, and two only, can possibly be raised.

(1.) Is it an abuse of a good thing ?

(2.) Is some use of the drug a necessity for the Chinese ?

As to the first, we all know, in this day of apologies, the usual course of sophistry when it deals with affairs of this sort, so that we will forestall it by admitting at once that a great many people smoke opium without dying on the spot ; that it is quite possible to meet men in China who smoke a good deal, and yet can do their work and live to a fair age ; and that if you landed at China to-morrow expecting to see the whole population prostrate with the sickness, or mad with the frenzy of opium, you would be pleasantly disappointed. Drunkenness is a great national sin at home, but still it is not every man in every street of London that is always lying dead drunk on the pavement. Still, in spite of apologetics, this much is quite clear, and undoubted. Opium is not to be supposed for an instant to be generally harmless, if only it be used in moderation, much less to be generally beneficial.

'It is impossible for any one acquainted with the subject,' says Sir Benjamin Brodie, 'to doubt that the habitual use of opium is productive of the most pernicious consequences. I cannot but regard those who promote the use of opium as a luxury, as inflicting a most serious injury on the human race.'

So that, once for all, let it be set down in black and white, that opium is not to be compared with *drink*. It is no more a natural ordinary requirement than quinine is. It is an entirely partial, accidental, artificial means of producing enjoyment, having no intimate relations with the usual life of the system, but, in certain exceptional illnesses, is an extremely useful medical tool. No one pretends to say that it is more than this. Only the sophists struggle as far as the position—'a moderate use need not seriously injure you.' Opium, then, is a medicine limited to certain good effects, but having the property of producing the most intense enjoyment, at all times and in all people, whether there be present in them the conditions that require it or not, and moreover its mode of introducing this enjoyment has all the perils of a stimulant, and these perils at their height, *i.e.* it grows upon the user, it controls him, it becomes an absolute though artificial need, it feeds on itself, it is boundless in its demands, it is quicker and more insidious in its effects than drink, its moderate use is far more difficult to manage, its abandonment and cure are far rarer, it is more imperious in its requirements, and this, with a sure tendency, as the need of the enjoyment develops, to destroy all self-control, to enervate the will, finally to ruin body and soul together.

It is a dangerous drug, then; it requires a strong hand to deal with it; it ought not to be thrown down in everybody's way; obviously, it ought to be kept guarded from those who are too ignorant or too weak to confine it to its true medicinal uses, and to keep their hands off its marvellous fascination. So every one would say. We are not pleased when we hear that a friend of ours indulges in opium. We tremble; true, he may not fall hopelessly, but we know that he is walking on the very edge of a moral precipice. Why, we in England have very nearly reached the point of setting severe limits on drink; and who can doubt how we should long ago have dealt with English drunkenness, if it had been an unnecessary and dangerous medicinal drug that produced it?

So every one of us would say, and, moreover, this is just what the Chinese say, and they say it with infinitely more force and consistency than we do. For it is the character of the people to be governed from above. It is their firm creed that

morality and politics are identical. They expect to be treated as a whole, as a single mass. They rely on public custom, on public law. 'The people are as the grass,' said Confucius; 'the king as the wind: let the wind blow, and the grass will bend.' It has been the work of twenty centuries to work and ingrain deeply this their belief. The people have not, therefore, the training, the discipline, the moral energy, as individuals, to rule themselves; they look to the law to back them up, to guide, to govern. They certainly, therefore, are not the people to be left to control themselves in the matter of a most perilous temptation. It is all very well to talk of the power of the individual to limit himself to the moderate use of the drug, but the Chinese have not the power; they do not see why they should have the power; they have failed hopelessly to limit themselves, and they know it. 'To smoke opium is always to walk on the edge of a precipice'—this everybody allows. 'Yes, and we especially have not the head for it,' say the Chinese. Why do they do it, then?

Is it a necessity for them? Not a bit: for until the last century they never had it, and the present use of it is a thing of yesterday. Public, national opium-smoking is not fifty years old. Old men in China can remember when the people were as yet untouched by it. This is far stronger evidence than any puzzling about the necessity of opium for ague in swamps; and, after all, all China is not a swamp; every third Chinaman has not got the ague, and it is uncertain how far the ague is benefited by opium; while, on the other hand, opium is inert and ineffective, in the case of the many diseases which it cures, on the opium-smoker who is already soaked with it.

Once more, then, why do they do it? Why do they say so much about the perils, and yet do not act upon these motives of moral prudence? They still keep the most stringent laws against the growth and use of opium on their statutes. Why, then, are these laws so inactive? Why have they broken down so ruinously? How did the nation and government ever fall into so evil and fatal a condition?

The answer is undeniable, we think. They came into this condition through English crime. They remain in this condition through English compulsion; and both crime and compulsion are not the mere reckless deeds of stray adventurers, but have been carried out, first under the shadow, and then by the instrumentality of the English Government; and, at this very hour, the English Government is the main party, most directly, and consciously, and deliberately benefited by

the compulsion and the crime, which have reduced the Chinese people to this melancholy case.

These are very strong statements: let us examine the grounds for them. Let us look over the history of the siege of China.

The history practically starts with the last century, when what we find is this:—The huge inland empire of China lies shut fast and tight, by law, against this opium; only that in its confident security that the walls are strong and its fortresses sound, it is careless about gates and posterns; and round about some of these sly entrances, the Portuguese, whose sinful commerce still leaves so foul a blight upon the hopes of African regeneration, creep and pry with offers of the seductive drug; and close at their heels follow the first skirmishers of our own attack, the ships of the East India Company. This Company is just beginning to enjoy its monopoly of the English trade with China; it is allowed to unpack and exhibit its merchandise at a legalised port; and, with all the rest of its bales, it often uncovers a chest of this curious stuff, and the Chinese mandarins do not scruple to wink at its introduction. It is smuggling, but smuggling which the Chinese Government make little effort to repress, and from which their local officers do not keep their hands altogether clean. Still the whole business is so small, that it was quite to be expected that the Chinese should be careless. The whole value of the East Indian opium sales, in 1793, was only 250,000*l.* a year; and even in 1809 it had only risen to 594,978*l.*, these figures including the home as well as the foreign consumption. But the mention of these figures brings forward a new feature, which henceforth becomes the marked characteristic of the opium trade. The figures represent what the Government reaped by opium sales, and this means that it had already become known that Indian soil was peculiarly fitted for growing opium, and already worth while for the Government itself to set to work at growing opium for the supply of the Chinese market. The East India Company had inherited the monopoly of the growth from its predecessors in sovereignty, and it is this monopoly which became then, and remains still, the main and fatal determinant of our policy towards the Chinese. The East India Company have left on record the high and anxious responsibility which they perceived at once to belong to the sole producers of so powerful and so perilous an instrument of luxury:—‘The leading feature of our policy,’ says their Finance Minister in 1829, ‘was to limit the manufacture, and to prevent as far as pos-

sible the sale and use of it in our territory, except for medicinal purposes.'

In 1817, the Court of Directors wrote to the Governor in Council in Bengal the famous and often quoted words,—

'We wish it to be clearly understood, that our sanction is given to these measures for the internal consumption of opium, not with a view to the revenue, but in the hope that they will tend to restrain the use of this pernicious drug, and that the regulations for the internal use of it will prevent its introduction into districts where it is not used. Were it possible to prevent the use of the drug altogether, except for the purposes of medicine, we would gladly do it out of compassion to mankind.'

So they thought, so they acted in the India which they governed; but it is 'our territory' of which they speak, it is 'the *internal* consumption, the *internal* use,' which they guard so jealously, so nobly; the external consumption, the external use of it, what of that? During the time between these two despatches there has been a tremendous development in the external consumption of our Indian opium: in 1817 the trade with China had taken 737,000*l.* worth of opium, far more, that is, than the whole revenue of the entire trade in 1809; and now in 1827, by constant increase, the use of the drug in China has brought into the Company's books 2,810,000*l.* The question is, will the Company, will England, allow the same principles of anxious watchfulness, of careful protection, and even repression, to be applied to this foreign consumption, which they apply themselves at home?

Certainly the Company did not allow this. It prepared more and more opium every year in the way which it had discovered by inquiry to be most attractive to the Chinese; it increased the supply as fast as it could venture to feed the demand; it allowed and helped the produce to make its way fast and freely into China, in defiance of those laws which were intended to carry out to the full the very principles of their own repression at home. Still, it may be justly said that, as yet, the Chinese Government showed no active desire to enforce their laws, or to stop this illegal traffic. But in 1836 an immense change has come over the scene. On the one hand, the Home Government has, at the renewal of the East India Company's Charter, adopted the responsibilities of the Indian Empire, and transformed the old trading Company into what is almost a Government department. In doing so, the whole question of the China trade has been discussed fully and largely in both Houses, and the decision come to at last that the new *régime* should retain in its hands the opium

monopoly, and, at the same time, should abandon the monopoly of trading with China, throw open the trade to all, and assume to itself the responsibility of keeping the open trade under obedience to the conditions of commerce allowed them by treaty with the Chinese at the single port of Canton. Both these positions are taken up by no haphazard or blind accident, but with deliberate and public purpose. Committees of the House of Commons and of the House of Lords sanctioned and recommended the revenue derived from the production of opium. They did so, knowing and approving its destination. 'The trade was perfectly well known to the Government of India,' says the Duke of Wellington in 1832, in answer to a motion of Lord Stanhope for a 'petition to Her Majesty to stop the trade;' 'it was perfectly well known to the Houses of Parliament, perfectly well known to Her Majesty's servants, to the East India Company, to the Government. It had been a great object to a Committee of the House of Lords that this trade should be continued.' Again, the Government distinctly took the place of authority over the general trading at Canton formerly exercised by the Company, by appointing an official Superintendent to succeed the supervising officers of the Company. It had, indeed, attempted to deal openly and frankly with the Chinese Government in this matter, by sending out a distinct Minister of Commerce, Lord Napier, with the object of making the trading a public question of agreement between the two Governments. This effort broke down under the ridiculous and perverse officialism of the Chinese, who refused all plain and direct intercourse with the Government. They would only allow our Superintendent to treat with a local board of merchants, the Hong Merchants, as a trader with traders; and we were driven to accept this position. Still, imperfect and subordinate as the position was, this Superintendent *was* the person recognised by the Chinese as the official head of the English trade; they petition for him to come; they petition him to act continually; they expect of him all the powers and authority which belonged to an official representative; and the Government, at home, distinctly appoint him, keep up constant direction over him, are in direct communication with him by the regular intercourse of despatches, and are warned continually that it is absolutely necessary, for the interests of trade, that the official and representative authority should be entrusted to him: absolutely necessary, for the difficulties of the situation are fast rising to a crisis. On the one hand, the opening of the general trade has allowed room for a swarm

of far rougher and wilder English craft than the old ships of the India Company, to run their chance with the smuggling of opium; and, on the other hand, the rapid increase of the trade has at last alarmed the Government of China, and they are continually meditating a stern revival of discipline—a repression of the loose venality of their Mandarins. Already in 1827, serious counsels begin to prevail. For a moment, indeed, the Chinese wavered; one Minister ventured to recommend the legalising of the trade; but this recommendation fell to the ground, and from 1829 till 1839, the effort to enforce the severity of the standing laws grows even more intense. An Imperial edict of 1834 announces decisive action. In 1837, our Superintendent, Captain Elliot, writes home: ‘The local government has been keeping up a severe system of restriction on opium, *which has been successful*.’ Letters from the Chinese Governor to Captain Elliot demand that the receiving ships for opium, coming in under cover of the British flag, should be stopped; they threaten that the laws should be capitally executed on resident foreigners. ‘Vigorous proceedings,’ writes Captain Elliot, ‘are being taken against native smugglers; opium boats are burned, the smugglers are scattered.’ In 1836, a Chinese caught smuggling is publicly hanged, to intimidate foreigners. The Chinese Government itself falls under displeasure at Court for lack of stringency. ‘There seems, my Lord,’ writes Captain Elliot once more to Lord Palmerston, in January 1839, ‘no longer reason to doubt that the Court has firmly determined to suppress, or, at least, most extensively to check the opium trade.’ Again, in April, the same statement; there have been many hundreds of seizures by the Government. It is obviously impossible for us to plead any longer that the Government connives; and therefore it becomes daily more and more urgent upon us to act. The Chinese Government cannot be expected to burn, scatter, hang its own native smugglers, and yet keep their temper with us, through whom alone the smuggling continues, and under whose flag it is carried on. So Captain Elliot feels most strongly. He is for ever writing home that the situation is growing desperate and begging for powers to be given him to exercise a real, practical, effective control over the British shipping. ‘The fact of opium,’ he writes, ‘being known to be by far the most important part of our import trade is itself a source of painful reflection; and the wide-spreading mischief which the manner of its pursuit necessarily entails aggravates the discomfort of the whole subject.’ He proves ‘the urgent necessity of arresting the

growing audacity of the smugglers.' 'As the danger and the shame of the trade increase' (owing to the attack upon it by the Government), 'it is obvious,' he writes, 'that it must fall into the hands of more and more desperate men; and so would stain the character of foreigners with constantly aggravated disgrace.'

Yet still nothing is done; no powers are given him to act. Accounts grow incessantly of ships now starting, armed to the teeth, from India for China, with crews of desperate adventurers, swearing to burn or kill all who resist their delivery of the drug. Opium has been brought in, in vast deliveries, under conflict of fire-arms; and all this by European ships belonging to British owners. 'It seems to me that the moment has come for active interposition upon the part of Her Majesty's Government.' So writes Captain Elliot; and again: 'No man entertains a deeper detestation of the sin and disgrace of this forced traffic than myself. I see little to choose between it and piracy.' 'After the most deliberate reconsideration of the whole traffic, which he heartily hopes has ceased for ever, the Chief Superintendent will once more declare his own opinion, that it was rapidly staining the British character with deep disgrace, and has exposed the vast interests of our commercial intercourse with this Empire to imminent jeopardy.'

So he keeps on writing; and all the time the Chinese are applying to him incessantly to stop these violent and flagrant outrages. 'We have repeatedly written to the foreigners,' say the Hong Merchants, 'begging them not to infringe our prohibitory laws.' Entreaties come in to him to stop the quick boats, 'the fast crabs and scrambling dragons,' which shoot the drug into the land; complaints against the British merchants who harbour it—'those iron-headed old rats.' He protests that he is powerless, that he cannot act outside the inner waters of Canton, that he does not see the papers of these ships, or know which are British. The Chinese retort:

'The Superintendent comes under command from his Sovereign to exercise control over the merchants, to repress the depraved; having had the commands, he must needs have the powers. It is very inexplicable, then, that these boats having entered the river in violation of the laws, he should now find himself without authority or confidence to turn them out again.'

It was quite true. He had indeed received the command; but the British Government are above conforming to the rigour of Chinese logic; he has not the powers. Once, he

proposes to Lord Palmerston to take strong action, and is told that he will be exceeding his authority. The utmost he can achieve is a warning, that those who smuggle do so at their own risk, that the Government will not be responsible for their misadventures.

So things drag on, until, in 1839, the crisis bursts. The Chinese, driven to desperation, send a high official to Canton, Commissioner Lin, with plenipotentiary powers to repress the illicit trade. Those powers he uses, as a Chinese would use them. He drew a cordon round the foreign factories, stopped the supplies of food and water, demanded the immediate surrender of the opium. Captain Elliot directed the surrender, constrained by paramount necessity affecting the lives and liberties of all foreigners resident in Canton. 20,291 chests of opium were surrendered, worth over two millions sterling, all Indian-grown; their contents were entirely destroyed. So he acted, roughly, arbitrarily, violently even, though no single European was actually injured or killed. But at home there is outcry, and indignation; the British blood is up. Our merchants have been insulted, imprisoned, threatened with starvation, in imminent peril. We go to war, our first opium war; we kill, shell, burn; we bombard forts, we loot cities, we compel the exaction of 6,000,000 of dollars as compensation for the opium which Lin destroyed.

There is a debate over this war in the House of Commons; Sir J. Graham leads the attack.

'They gave you notice,' says Mr. Gladstone in his most powerful speech, 'to abandon your contraband trade; when they found that you would not, they had a right to drive you from their coasts, for your obstinacy in persisting in this infamous and atrocious traffic. A war more unjust in its origin, more calculated to cover this country with permanent disgrace, I do not know, and I have not read of.'

In support of the war, Sir G. Staunton, a great Chinese authority, said :—

'I yield to no member of the House in my detestation of the impolicy and immorality of this opium traffic. I feel confident that friendly relations with China cannot co-exist with a large smuggling trade carried on under the British flag.'

He supports the war, simply because it alone can lead to the co-operation of England with China in suppressing a trade, 'which, without such co-operation, must become every day more piratical and buccaneering in its character.' Two great names defend the war, Lord Palmerston and Lord (then Mr.) Macaulay. Neither of them attempt to defend the trade

itself. 'I should be the last person,' says Lord Palmerston, 'to defend a trade which violates the municipal law of the country, and supplies an immense population with the means of demoralisation.' But what then? Why, 'who believes in the sincerity of the Chinese Government?' Yet he had been assured for years by his Superintendent, that the Government was most sincere. 'It is not the opium they dread, but the exportation of silver.' Yet, 'I never denied,' said Sir G. Staunton, in 1843—the best authority in the House—'that had there been no smuggling, there would have been no war;' and every despatch of Captain Elliot had insisted that it was the opium that was the point in question. Then comes a most audacious and monstrous defence. 'If we had tried to stop the trade, two-thirds of our British subjects would still have carried it on. Our orders would most certainly have been violated by two-thirds of our own subjects; could we use force against ourselves?' Certainly, that is an argument which is unanswerable, but it is not one that it is pleasant to have to record of a Prime Minister in the English Parliament.

'If the trade was expelled from Canton, it would only spread over the whole coast. Do honourable Members expect Her Majesty's Government to defend the whole Chinese coast from smugglers?' So asks Lord Macaulay; and in answer comes the emphatic retort of Mr. Gladstone: 'The whole of the opium comes from our own ports; it is grown by the Company, the Government itself, on purpose for China. To stop smuggling, we have only to cease growing it ourselves.'

'The Chinese could not stop it if they would;' but as a fact, they did stop it; for four months not a chest was sold.

'But can we allow the Chinese to seize 200 British merchants!' asks Lord Macaulay. 'Were there five of those merchants free from the traffic?' answers Mr. Gladstone. An American, Mr. King, asked the Canton British merchants in 1838 to give a written pledge to take no further part in the trade; they would not sign it. Why? because one and all were interested in the illicit traffic. Mr. Dent, the chief merchant, demanded by the Chinese for examination, had made a large fortune, we believe, by the trade; yet the Duke of Wellington, in the House of Lords, declared that he would 'fight with the last drop of his blood rather than surrender him into their hands,' and this, though Lord Palmerston had written in 1832 that merchants who smuggled did it at their own risk.

The Government obtained a majority of ten in a crowded house, after a three nights' debate.

The war ended ; opium was not mentioned in the treaty, because the Emperor would not hear it discussed, though we had the boldness to propose its legalisation ; but five more ports are opened to our general commerce, and through all of them opium is poured in, and, above all, we have compelled them to give us the small island of Hong-Kong, and there, within a stone's throw of their coast, with all the memories of the war still fresh and ringing—memories of all the dark crimes and deep confessed disgraces of that evil and infamous trade which our flag had covered—we establish a market for opium—a market farmed by the Government itself—sold to the highest bidder, to supply a swarm of reckless pirates who, with its produce, swarm up and down the coast. From Hong-Kong, a huge smuggling trade in opium has been carried on from that day to this, from shops held under licences sold by the British Government. Even now that the trade is legalised, between the years 1865 and 1872, 2,600,000 lbs. of opium have been passed from Hong-Kong into China without paying duty.

We must hurry on ; it is impossible to stop long over a most interesting debate in 1843, brought on by Lord Shaftesbury (then Lord Ashley) in the House of Commons. The noticeable points in his speech are these : the evidence for the entire change in the whole feeling of China towards our commerce ; 'the people are intensely desirous to engage in traffic,' wrote Sir George Robinson, in 1833 ; 'the Chinese are the most trafficking people in Asia,' said Mr. Marjoribanks, a great chief of the India Company ; 'it is a perfect axiom that the Chinese are most anxious for our trade,' said Lord Napier, in 1834. 'Now, everywhere, in every way, our trade meets with coldness, hatred, opposition.' The change is explained to Sir. H. Pottinger by a Chinese Minister. 'We have been united by a friendly commercial policy for 200 years. How then are the old relations changed ? assuredly from the spreading opium poison.' Lord Ashley brings out the effect of this bitter enmity on a point where it makes an English Christian tremble and shudder with a shameful fear. The English Baptists have been compelled, by the hatred of Englishmen by Chinese, to do their missionary work in China by means of the American Baptist Society, voting money to it, giving their men to it, so different is the respect in which the two nations are held, so impossible is it for an Englishman to take up the position of a Christian preacher while the

slur of the opium trade is identified with his name. This chimes in with the theory developed by the Chinese to explain how it is that people of the same tongue can appear in such different characters, as Evangelists and opium traders; they have settled it must be that all opium traders are English, all missionaries are American.

The speech called out some strong statements from Sir G. Staunton, witnessing, first, to the practical facility of the old trade in former days with China, in spite of the arrogant language and absurd obstructions of the official etiquette; and then declaring that not only, if there had been no opium, would there have been no war, but that even if 'the opium trade had been allowed to run its natural course, and had not received an extraordinary impulse from the measures taken by the East India Company to promote its growth, it would never have excited in the Chinese Government that extraordinary alarm which betrayed them into a *coup-d'état* for its suppression.'

'Sir,' said Lord Ashley, at the close of his speech, in stirring, high-minded eloquence, 'the condition of the empire does indeed demand a most deep and solemn consideration; within and without we are hollow and insecure. True it is, that we wear a certain appearance of majesty and strength: but, with one arm in the East and another in the West, we are in too many instances trampling under foot every moral and religious obligation.'

His motion is not unkindly received by the Government, only Sir Robert Peel begs him not to press it, inasmuch as the Government are themselves fully anxious about the question, and are even now engaged in negotiations with the Chinese, which a vote might complicate. To show the earnestness of Her Majesty's Government, he appeals to their instructions to Sir H. Pottinger: 'The British merchant who smuggles must be made aware that he does so at his own risk and can receive no support;' and he declares, in words made remarkable by their contrast with history, that Her Majesty's Government will 'have power, the moment Hong-Kong is completely ceded, to prevent the importation of opium into Hong-Kong, for the purpose of exportation into China.' This is that Hong-Kong, in which the Governor could issue a notice a year later, that the privilege of selling opium in Hong-Kong, whether for consumption in the colony or otherwise, 'will be sold by auction, at the office of the chief magistrate of police,' for the benefit of Her Majesty's revenues. It is this Hong-Kong, in which the opium licences

and farm brought us in 12,000*l.* in 1861. It is this Hong-Kong of which our Consuls in China can write to us in 1873: 'No article is so largely smuggled into this province as opium from the British colony of Hong-Kong.' With this appeal of Sir R. Peel, the debate ended.

We come to the great, the crowning moment of this long history. From 1842 till 1857, the fret, and worry, and endless quarrel of an incessant piracy, fed chiefly from our Government emporium in Hong-Kong, have laid up stores of indignant memories in the hearts of the Chinese; the more so, since the amount of opium poured into the country from our own Indian ports has risen from the 17,000 chests of 1834, and the 29,000 chests of 1840, to 74,000 in 1857. Our war has enabled us to do more than double the amount of smuggled opium since the old buccaneering days of Captain Elliot's trouble. A swarm of native ships, manned by the offscourings of China, buy registers from us, and, under the name and freedom of British ships, ply their disloyal and debasing traffic.

One day, the Chinese Government see their opportunity; they seize one of these boats in the act of smuggling, they capture the men and the opium; but the ship has been registered to be British, and they are called upon to surrender them. They do so; they give back the whole number unhurt. But this is not enough for our Consul, Sir John Bowring. He declares the British flag to have been insulted; he demands a national apology, and, more than this, he uses the occasion to demand, in an ultimatum, that which the Chinese had for years resisted on political grounds of their own, the free entrance of our Consul-Envoy to Peking. He demands these imperious war-terms, under threat of at once proceeding to throw shot and shell into the defenceless and vast commercial city of Canton. The Chinese protest; they confess a mistake, they give up the men of this pirate *lorcha*; only they deny their intention to insult the British flag; they refuse to own a crime, or to acknowledge the right of these strong reprisals. For this, war is at once proclaimed; the British fleet is ordered up; there is a bombardment, a terrible and destructive display of warlike force; a large and definite war is begun.

Now what was the ship, for the insult done to which Mr. Parkes, our official, is told to write to Commissioner Yeh—'I am to inform your Excellency that, however much we may regret the display of force which your Excellency, by violation of treaty, has compelled, we shall proceed with the de-

struction of all the defences and public buildings of the city, and of the vessels in the river, unless you at once comply with every demand that has been made ?'

Here is the account of it printed in the leading article of the *Guardian* of that day. The ship was Chinese, Chinese manned, Chinese built, Chinese owned, known in Chinese smuggling, with Chinese pirates on board, yet claiming the right to use the British flag by the questionable act of a Colonial legislature stretching dangerously the terms of a treaty : an act, made without agreement with the Chinese, though it allowed their own ships, after taking a temporary register at a foreign port, to return to their own harbours under the protection of a foreign flag. It was a mongrel craft, in which everything but the register was Chinese, caught in the act of a nefarious violation of the country's Custom law.

Not only this, but, incredible as it may sound, the legal point itself, on which the claim was rested, was not valid ; the ship's register had already passed its limit of time, and had ceased to be in force. More than this, Sir J. Bowring knew it. 'The lorcha, *Arrow*,' he wrote to Commissioner Yeh, 'lawfully bore the British flag under a register granted by me.' 'The *Arrow*,' he wrote to his agent, Mr. Parkes, 'had no right, I fear, to hoist the British flag ; her register expired on the 27th September. From that day she really had no right to protection.'

These things are no invention of our own ; they were not done in a corner ; they are the topics of public documents and of public debate.

No wonder, then, that Lord Derby, in the censure which he moved upon the Government of Lord Palmerston for engaging in such a war, broke out into that famous and magnificent appeal, with which he brought his opening speech to a close :

'If I might, my lords, on this question make any especial appeal, I would make it to that Right Reverend Bench, which it would have afforded me gratification to have seen more fully attended on this occasion. To them I would appeal as emphatically the servants of Him who came to bring peace and goodwill to all mankind. I would appeal to them as the legitimate rebukers of oppression and tyranny. It is for them, with their high authority and their great and legitimate influence, to endeavour to stay the uplifted hands of violence and oppression, and to rebuke the shedding of innocent blood. My lords, I should rejoice if the Fathers of the Christian Church should place themselves at the head of this great cause, which is the cause of humanity, of religion, and of civi-

lisation. I should deeply deplore, if, on such an occasion, the Church should give an uncertain sound, if its sanction should be extended to deeds of violence which in its conscience it cannot approve.

But, my lords, if I should be disappointed in this hope as regards the Right Reverend Bench, then I turn with undiminished confidence to the hereditary Peerage of Great Britain. I turn to them humbly, earnestly, but with confidence. I appeal to them to declare by their vote to-night that they will not sanction the usurpation, by unworthy and subordinate authorities, of that most awful prerogative of the Crown, the declaration of war ; that they will not tolerate upon light and trivial grounds of quarrel, and upon cases of doubtful justice, the capture of commercial ships, the bombardment of an undefended city ; and that they will not give the sanction of their voices to the shedding of the blood of unwarlike and innocent people, without warrant of law, and without moral justification.'

No wonder that Bishop Wilberforce (though, we fear, alone among the Bishops) thundered out his indignant warnings : 'Depend upon it, there is a Power which never fails in its own good time to visit the evil doings of the oppressor, and which never leaves a great wrong unavenged.'

No wonder that Mr. Gladstone caught up, and carried on, with all the fire of a wrathful righteousness, the appeal made by Lord Derby to the House of Lords :—

'The history of the war will be this : the subordinate officers of England, in a remote quarter of the globe, misconstrued the intentions of their country, and acted in violation of all right. The executive at home failed to check them. Appeal was made in eloquence befitting the occasion to the House of Lords. It was made to Bishops ; it was made to nobles ; and it failed. But England is not yet committed. It does not rest with officers abroad : it does not rest with the executive at home ; it does not rest with the House of Lords, to declare finally what shall be the policy of England. Sir, that function lies within the walls of the House of Commons. It is with us, in this assembly, which is the paramount power of the State, that it lies to determine whether this great wrong shall remain unchecked and uncorrected. With every one of us it lies to show that this House, which is the first, the most ancient, the noblest Temple of Freedom in the world, is also the Temple of that everlasting justice, without which freedom would be only a name, and a curse to humanity.'

Lord Ellenborough and Lord Grey, Sir Roundell Palmer, Mr. Cobden, Lord John Russell, all spoke and voted together with Lord Derby and Mr. Disraeli in that great debate ; and the Government was thrown out by a majority of sixteen. Lord Palmerston appealed to the country ; and the country,

ignoring the immediate question, and voting for general confidence in Lord Palmerston, who had fought through the Crimean war, returned him to office. There followed a war of two years; the burning and barbarous sacking of the Summer Palace; the taking of Peking: the Elgin treaty, or treaty of Tientsin, in which, at first, owing, apparently, to the invincible repugnance of Lord Elgin to introduce the subject to the Chinese authorities, opium is not mentioned, though he had instructions to 'ascertain whether the Chinese would revoke their prohibition of the trade.' At last, his delegates induce the Chinese to confess the necessity of a change, and to legalise the traffic. To deter smoking, China proposed a high tariff of sixty taels per chest, but this would never do for us, so we reduced it by half. Once since, in negotiations with Sir Rutherford Alcock, the Chinese obtained permission from him to raise the tariff to fifty taels; but the Home Government refused to ratify this revision. The treaty of Tientsin still holds good; and well has it achieved its purpose: for, while the old smuggling, fostered by the first war, only enabled us to get 70,000 chests a year into China, we have since reached the total of 84,000; and, instead of the old 3,000,000*l.* of net opium revenue made before the war of 1857, we have in 1872 secured 7,000,000*l.* of revenue from the same source. The Government, it appears, had no bad eye for business; since they have taken the opium monopoly in hand in 1833, they have by hook and by crook raised its net receipts from 800,000*l.* a year to 7,000,000*l.* Such an advantage is it to have armies ready at hand to back up your trade, and to induce unwilling customers 'to see the necessity for a change' in the policy of their markets.

This, then, is the last China war; so begun, so ended; a war most characteristic of our contact with China, beginning in fraud, fulfilled in violence, dragging us along an evil path, which we are almost ashamed to follow, yet which, at each point, the sheer and straitened necessities of the situation afford us excuse enough for pursuing, so that we know not how to escape from the dark destiny, except by some violent break with that whole position which the policy of years has driven us to adopt, and against this violent break a thousand plausible arguments fly to the rescue. This is our last war, the memory of which is stamped upon the life of China by the abiding ruins of the beautiful palace which we gutted and sacked; and now, at the end of this long tale of uncomfortable deeds, we turn to ask how we stand as a people? What has been the result to us? What advance have we

made? How have we bettered the old state of things? The answer is this. We find that that very forcing of opium upon China which in old days we spoke of as 'that detestable traffic,' 'that iniquitous trade:' that of which Mr. Marjoribanks, head of the Company, said, 'Opium is a pernicious poison: it is a painful subject of contemplation that we should continue to pour this black and envenomed poison into the sources of human happiness;' that of which Lord Palmerston said, 'I should be the last person to defend a trade which supplies an immense population with the means of demoralisation;' that of which Sir G. Staunton said, in defending the first war, 'I yield to no man in my detestation of the immorality and impolicy of this opium trade, and in anxiety to suppress it;' that, which all acknowledged to be an outrage, yet which none knew how to check or stay, without using British power against British subjects—that trade we, as a nation, have taken upon ourselves to force upon the Chinese, boldly, in the face of day, by a treaty which our cannon compelled her to sign. We have made it a matter of imperial policy to do that which our desperate smugglers used to manage for us. We avoid, it may be, a certain amount of violence by this forcible legislation of the trade, but the ruin of China, which it was the object of her old rigid Custom laws to avoid, is achieved far more completely by the legal system than by the smuggling: for the opium introduced now is double the old in quantity. Whatever we may say of our good intentions, the result of our policy and of our wars has been to advance steadily and unbrokenly the consumption of opium in China. This has been the one undoubted effect which each new move of ours has produced. Whatever else happened, the market for opium grew, our revenue derived from the Chinese market rose. We began with it at 800,000*l.*, we end with it at 7,000,000*l.* Originally, a few Mandarins smuggled in two ship-loads a year; now, a third of the nation would die of hunger to-morrow, we are told, if the supply were cut off.

This is the ugly fact, that, throughout, China grows more demoralised, that our revenues continually grow; and this being so, we yet can endure to listen complacently to our Minister as he writes to us:—

'We are prone to forget that the footing we have in China has been obtained by force, and by force alone: it is to the fear of force alone that we are indebted for the safety we enjoy. Nothing has been received from the goodwill of the Chinese; the concessions made have been extorted against the conscience of the nation, in

defiance of its moral convictions; the very extension of our trade must appear to them morally wrong, and the story of foreign intercourse during the last thirty years can have had no effect but to confirm them in this opinion.'

We receive without a sign, we put into some forgotten pigeon-hole, without an answer, without a word of recognition, the earnest and noble petition of Prince Kung and his Ministers to Her Majesty's Government—a petition so earnest, dignified, and solemn, that it gives the very tone of tragedy to the helplessness of this old-world people before the remorseless persistency of the modern advance. 'Day and night they consider,' the writers say, 'the question of this opium trade, and the more they reflect upon it, the greater does their anxiety become, and hereon they cannot avoid addressing his Excellency very earnestly on the subject.' They discuss all the ways of dealing with the problem; they decide that nothing will succeed but 'prohibition, to be enforced alike by both parties.'

'The Chinese merchant supplies your country with goodly tea and silk; but the English merchant empisons China with pestilent opium. Such conduct is unrighteous. Who can justify it? What wonder if officials and people say that England is wilfully working out China's ruin? Were both nations vigorously to prohibit the growth of the poppy, both the traffic and the consumption of opium might be put an end to. . . . Day and night they, the writers, give to this matter most earnest thought, and overpowering is the distress and anxiety it occasions them. Having thus presumed to unbosom themselves, they would be honoured by his Excellency's reply.'

But that honour is never done them; their appeal is not considered worth even a notice of receipt.

Yet we are officially assured that they are in earnest. Sir Rutherford Alcock, to whom the letter is written, states, before a Committee of the House of Commons:—

'Officially and privately the Imperial Ministry have shown themselves perfectly ready to give up the whole revenue which they derive from the opium duty (1,500,000*l.* per annum) if they could only induce the British Government to co-operate with them in any way to put it down. They would not hesitate one moment to say—"Let our revenue go, we care nothing about it. What we want to stop is the consumption of opium, which is impoverishing the country, and demoralising and brutalising our people."

Strong words, these; yet we cannot afford even to allow them to raise the tariff. We shut our ears; or, when we send

our Minister to a conference with them, it is to say, that we consider that they could not exclude our opium by prohibition if they tried, so that we are quite justified in refusing by force to let them try; or, we inform them, through the same source, that it is their fault for taking too much; that if their people will ask for it, they must expect us to continue to sell it; which means, that the Chinese Government, knowing that the people cannot resist the temptation, beg that it may not be thrown in their way; and we answer: You are quite right; the people evidently cannot resist; so we persist, in spite of your entreaties, in flooding them with opportunities for indulging; but then it is their fault for being so weak as to give way to our enticings. We know, that is, that a man is a drunkard; we refuse to allow him to cut himself off from the sight of drink; we spread our public-houses round him, and then tell him he is a fool to take too much of the drink we offer him.

Or, again, we argue: You Chinese grow opium yourselves, though your laws forbid it; therefore you cannot be in earnest. That is, the object of the Chinese laws is to stop entirely all use of opium, but as that is impossible through our trade, the authorities do not rigidly press the severe laws against its native growth; and we then argue that, because they do not press the laws when it would be perfectly and hopelessly useless to do so, therefore they would not press them when there was a chance of their achieving their purpose; and this, though, when once they had the chance, they did press the laws most effectually, and though, again, Sir Rutherford Alcock assures us that he believes them to be most thoroughly in earnest, and ready to give up 1,500,000% of revenue a year in order to do it. As it is, they are at present under the most powerful temptation to press forward their own native growth, in order that, at least, if opium is to be smoked, it may be Chinese and not the hated foreigners who shall reap the profits. We are, at this moment, in a horrible fright lest they should attempt, and succeed in this. They indeed would be ruined more utterly, more irretrievably, it might be, but, at least, they would, in their own fall, have ruined the trade of their seducers.

But, if this argument of the Chinese lack of earnestness or want of possible efficiency fails us, we have another ready; we say: 'Ah, but remember *how* they stopped it before! You would not like to see the process; it would probably consist in cutting off the heads of opium-smokers, in doing as Commissioner Lin did;' that is, we now argue

that they would be so terribly in earnest, so terribly efficient, that we should hardly have stomach enough for their rough and ready methods ; and, indeed, we are performing a kind and Christian duty in stopping them from reforming themselves too rudely and too violently.

Then, perhaps, at this point, we Christians are given a threat. ' Well, if the Chinese are allowed to expel the opium, they will probably kick out the missionaries too ; the same treaty admits the one, as the other.' It is an insult, an outrage, that it should ever have been thought possible to address such arguments to a Christian Church ; that it should ever have been supposed, for one moment, that we would consent to consider the advantage of securing an entry for our faith in the trail of an iniquitous injustice. If once we failed to spurn such a temptation with loathing and contempt, in God's name let us abandon our claim to have any regenerative truth to tell to the Chinese. They can do better by themselves.

Lastly, we are given an argument which we know not how to characterise, for if we had not found it again and again addressed by Indian officials to the Indian Council of State, we should have called it devilish in its utter recklessness, its cool cynicism. It is the argument that allows opium to be, for the Chinese, a deadly and degrading poison, but says : They will have it somehow ; some one must profit by this vile craving ; why not we ? As they must have it, better that they should have good opium from us than grow worse for themselves ; (though ' good ' here means ' strong,' as far as we can see the evidence, and ' worse ' means ' weak.') Let us state this argument clearly. We have, by incessant smuggling under the cover of our own trade and treaties, by establishing public markets for smuggling on the edge of the coast, by open introduction of opium backed by all the force of our armies into a treaty of trade, formed, fed, and fostered in the Chinese such a violent growth of evil that now we doubt the possibility of its being checked, and therefore consider it to be more prudent and wise to make a handsome profit by ministering to its horrible and unnatural extravagance.

Such are the usual arguments—arguments put forward seriously, publicly, by officers and chiefs, found on the lips of Ministers and Members of Parliament, recorded in reports, cheered in debates—arguments of which the best hardly rises higher than the apology of Cain—' Am I my brother's keeper ? '—arguments against the worst of which

stands written the awful condemnation—‘It must needs be that offences come, but yet woe to that man by whom they come! It had been better for that man, if he had never been born!’

But once more we fall back in astonishment and dismay, to ask—Why is it, how is it, that all this repulsive drama goes on unchecked? Why is it that this shady pleading is required, and, what is more, is apparently effective in an assembly of English gentlemen? The old answer comes. None of these doubtful arguments are quite real or strong; it is not they that actually persuade, we are not so bad as that; they are, at best, only active skirmishers, useful allies; but another force lies in reserve. Why was it that, years ago, that ugly smuggling was so little checked by those who revolted at its cruelties? Mr. Gladstone told us: it was because the East India Company grew the opium; the whole of it not only came from British ports, but was the actual stock in trade of the very Society which was expected to stop the smuggling of it. The Company lived by the monopoly; they farmed out the land to grow it; they farmed out the licences to sell it; even that which was not grown by them in Western India, they drew to their own ports, and taxed heavily for exportation. No wonder there was a lack of earnestness in the effort against this most profitable smuggling. No wonder that men, with all their horror at what was done in China, still carefully closed their eyes to the one way of escape. It is easy to persuade yourself that others would grow opium for the smugglers if you did not, but this has still got to be shown, while ever the fact remains that the East India Company were always the producers of the opium which others smuggled into China under cover of open trade allowed them by treaty; and more, that they spent a mass of influence and energy in stimulating the growth of opium on purpose for the China trade. ‘The great object of the Bengal opium,’ says Dr. Butler, examiner for the Benares Agency, ‘is to furnish an article suitable to the peculiar tastes of the population of China. So it must be so prepared as to retain its native sensible qualities, and its solubility in hot water, for this is how the Chinese like it.’ Licences to ships were given by the Company with direct mention of taking their opium to China, according to Lord Ashley, in 1843. No plausible suggestions of what might happen, no vague dreaming of worse possibilities, can change this most damaging, most damning fact of the Company’s profiting by the evil it deplored, or excused. As long as that fact remains, the Company was not in a position to have a

voice in deciding what was best for China. Its witness is, simply, out of court; it is judging its own cause; its mouth is shut. So much for the Company; and now, by tragic irony of history, at the very moment that the Elgin Treaty was identifying the British Government with the forcible introduction of opium in China, so that it took up the business of the old smugglers, the Indian Mutiny threw into its hands the fortunes of the ruined Company, and the Government discovered itself to be the inheritor of that old opium monopoly in Bengal. So that at the close of the period whose history we are summing up, we find the British Government itself to be at once the active agent for the introduction of the drug into China, in spite of the laws, and in defiance of the desires of the Chinese, and, also, that the one body of men who, more than any, profit by the sale, and spend all their energies in increasing the means of the public demoralisation, is again the British Government itself. It holds the monopoly on the Bengal side. It brings the Bombay opium under its system of taxation, gaining enormously by the duty paid. It promotes the growth by artificial means; it advances money to all who will grow it in preference to cereals. It has officers who constantly urge the importance of extending the trade; who write to it—'Immediate measures of the most energetic character ought to be taken with the object of increasing the production of opium' (Honourable J. Strachey, 1869); who receive notes—'Are you quite satisfied that the fullest possible extension is being pushed in the Benares Agency?' (Honourable W. Grey to Chas. H. Campbell, 1869). 'If we do not do this, the Chinese will do it for themselves' (Sir R. Temple, 1869). It has pushed the trade at the risk of corrupting the Indian natives (Sir W. Muir). It encourages this extension solely and on purpose for China. Out of the 7,000,000*l.* profit a year, not 1,000,000*l.* of it is gained by the home consumption; all the rest is drawn from China. 'It is expedient to retain the trade,' said the report of the House of Commons in 1833, 'because the profit of it is made almost entirely from the *foreign* consumers.' The Government keeps all its Consuls in China in active watch on the demand; it can print in a public resolution—'The Supreme Government has resolved to increase the annual provision of opium in Bengal for export to China to 60,000 chests:' for export to a country, which the Supreme Government's armies have forced to accept it. Do you say, a Government monopoly gives control, diminishes rather than increases the produce? It may be so, when the Government is paternally anxious for the welfare of its own

people, but there are no grounds here for its considering the welfare of the unfortunate Chinese; on the contrary, we plead, that we cannot take their good into consideration; that, if they are fools enough to demand opium, we cannot do otherwise than supply them to the full extent of their demands. We use immense pressure to back up the cultivation; we are dependent, for our Budget, on the success of the trade; and when you ask the Government whether they do take this moral care which belongs to a monopoly, they frankly answer, No—not a bit. ‘Do any moral considerations at all influence the Government in the opium growth?’ asks Mr. Fawcett of Sir Cecil Beadon, Lieut.-Governor of Bengal. ‘The Government only regards opium as a means of obtaining revenue,’ is the answer. ‘They would not be deterred from doubling the growth, by any considerations of the deleterious effect which opium might produce on the people to whom it was sold?’ ‘Probably not.’ That is plain enough: and yet, in the face of all this, Members of Parliament have the audacity to compare our opium monopoly with the Gothenberg system of public-houses!

Let us pass to the final, the closing argument which winds up every speech in every debate. ‘7,000,000*l.* to Indian finance!’ This is the real crux, the overwhelming difficulty. Tell us how to supply our Indian Budget, and we will gladly throw over the opium trade. Till then, till you do so, *you* who object are ‘mere sentimental philanthropists,’ and ‘*we*, we are a practical people.’ ‘We are a practical people!’ That is the defence which an Under-Secretary of State ventures to utter from his place in the House of Commons, and the House of Commons cheers, and votes, contentedly. ‘A practical people!’ Yes, so practical, that we can ignore the acknowledged infamy of the past under the sanction of the immediate and secure profits of the present. So practical, that we dare to think with a cool and careless indifference, that commercial needs are sufficient arguments wherewith to banish the memories of crime, fraud, and violence, and can by such arguments actually succeed in silencing the protest of conscience and the voice of eternal justice; and this, though the commercial needs, with which we argue, are the profits still to be derived from the very sin for which we mean them to be an apology. ‘I have sinned, I know it, I confess it; but the gain I have won by the sin is so large, so necessary, that the sin itself must be allowed to be justified.’ This is ‘our practice,’ and it is against such practice that we would summon the Church of England to emphatically rebel. This

is the very peril of being practical, with which we began this paper. It is impossible that English fairness, English justice, above all, English Christianity, should accept these conclusions, should cheer these arguments, should condescend to these manœuvres, if it were not that its close attention to practice had blinded it to principle. If once the imagination of this people could lift its eyes from the mean and confused entanglement of circumstance, and could seize the ideal lines which make this long history a very epic of a nation's disgrace, an epic in which there is visibly at work the whole drama of a moral fall, the first encroachments of temptation half admitted, the growing evil, which once allowed a footing springs up and asserts a sudden dominion, and drives like a black fate, whether we will or no, until at each moment the difficulty of stopping is intensified, and until at last, with a dreadful irony, the entire pressure of events conspires to force into our hands the magnificent prizes which the evil has won, and now dares us to let them go, dares us to break loose from the clutches of this haunting prosperity—if once, we say, the imagination of England could seize and hold the ideal lines of this great drama, we should, we trust, hear no more of financial success, no more of the practical argument of the Indian Budget. Rather we cannot but believe that the moral spirit of the people would rise like a flood, and sweep down, in the fury of its indignant repentance, the barriers which circumstance has so laboriously piled, and built, and bonded.

We do not, indeed, want people to shut their eyes to these practical difficulties ; it is the penalty of a long-permitted evil, that it demands long, and patient, and laborious undoing ; we cannot get rid of it in a moment, it will require care, and consideration, and trouble, and prudence ; it will take wise heads and practised hands to set things straight, to unravel the meshes, to shift the direction of forces, to balance and ease the strain ; it will not be done in a day ; it can only be achieved slowly, and with pain ; but with all this, we want it to be confessed that, as Churchmen, we are pledged to a definite public policy in this matter, pledged to let none of these political or financial considerations, complicated, and real, and influential as they are, stand in the way of our incessant demand that this Chinese trade should be sooner or later abandoned, and the Chinese, at least, be allowed their moral freedom to act, in the midst of an awful public peril, as they themselves think fit. For we Churchmen are pledged to emphasise the unity of the nation's history, the reality of

its past ; pledged to make men remember that this past can never be forgotten, that we never may say, ' Well, the past is a bad thing, but anyhow it cannot be helped, it is gone ; the case now must be decided by practical reason, the difficulties, the advantages, the expedience of the hour.' This, *we* know well, can never be. There is a call to repentance, to reparation, sounding to us out of the past, ideal, if you will, but yet far more real and living than ' thousands of gold and silver.' The past cannot be laid like a ghost. It demands vigorously the execution of its inexorable laws, those laws which will never acquit the evil-doer, as long as he still enjoys the gains of his evil-doing, much less can allow him to plead in excuse for his evil the urgent need of those very gains themselves. We cannot suffer now these exigencies of the moment to govern our action in this matter of the opium trade with China ; we are bound already, by the necessities of the past, to a distinct act of amends, of reparation, of self-sacrifice in evidence of repentance ; we are bound to pay this by a bond which no practical arguments can be allowed to loosen or undo. They may justly retard the moment of payment ; they may come in to decide how, and when, it can best be done, they may rightly forbid us to do it hastily, or rashly, or feverishly, but still they cannot, if anything of what is here said be true, be allowed to affect the main and certain law of duty. We may listen, we may think them over, they may urge us to this or that ; but the final issue is already decided, and this they cannot touch. Our course, then, is clear. Statesmen may well plead that they cannot break through these arguments of practical needs and necessities, unless they feel that the nation's conscience is alive, and requires imperiously that the effort should be made ; but just because this is so, is it the duty of the Church to rouse the national conscience, until it makes upon its statesmen that imperious demand.

ART. II.—LITURGICAL REVISION.

1. *The First Book of Common Prayer of Edward VI., and the Ordinal of 1549, together with the Order of Communion, 1548.* Reprinted entire and edited by Rev. HENRY BASKERVILLE WALTON, M.A. (London : Rivingtons, 1869.)
2. *The Primer, set forth at large.* (London : Masters, 1870.)
3. *The Night Hours of the Church.* (London : Hayes, 1870.)
4. *The Book of Common Prayer, according to the Use of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America.* (New York, 1841.)
5. *Private Prayers, put forth by Authority in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth.* (Parker Society : Cambridge, 1851.)
6. *The Book of Common Prayer, Revised for Use in the Evangelical Churches.* (London : W. J. Johnson, 1867.)
7. *Notes on the Church : and on the Question of Revision.* By C. W. ANDREWS, D.D. (Philadelphia : Lippincott and Co., 1874.)
8. *Journals of the General Synod of the Church of Ireland.* (Dublin : Hodges and Foster, 1870-1875.)
9. *Liturgical Purity our Rightful Inheritance.* By JOHN C. FISHER, M.A. Second Edition. (London : Hamilton and Adams, 1860.)

THE fact that there has been for some time past a seeming lull in the matter of Liturgical Revision of the Book of Common Prayer, and that no very immediate action on a large scale is imminent, is rather an additional reason for discussing the question when the din of party strife is not too loud to permit moderate counsels to be heard. But, in truth, the most weighty plea in favour of timely inquiry into the subject is that the process of Revision is actually going on piecemeal, and with no very intelligent survey of the bearings as a preliminary to any one instalment. The New Lectionary of 1871, the Shortened Services Act, the debates in the Convocation of Canterbury on rubrical amendments, none of them marked by any sufficient care or knowledge, and all fraught with at least the possibility of serious consequences, are examples of formal and recognised inroads on the Act of Uniformity ; while such practical, though un-

authorised, additions to the scanty group of Anglican formularies as the Three Hours' Devotion, Harvest Thanksgivings, Public Institution of Incumbents, Ordination of Readers and Deaconesses, and Children's Services, prove incontestably that the narrow limits of the Common Prayer-Book are no longer adequate for the spiritual needs of the Church of England.

There are, probably, very few educated persons who could now be found to say, as the late Archbishop Longley did in one of his last public utterances—a sermon on 'The Liturgy and Ritualism,' preached on S. Peter's Day, 1867, at the consecration of S. Mary Bredin, Canterbury—that 'the Church of England puts into the hands of all her members a form of sound words suited for every occasion on which the servants of God join together in acts of combined adoration;' whereas the very ceremony he was then and there engaged in performing, the dedication of a church, has never had a place in the Reformed Prayer-Book at all. The incident is noteworthy as exhibiting with much force the exact degree of intelligent attention which dignitaries of Archbishop Longley's school thought, and still think, necessary for inquiry before pronouncing dogmatically on difficult ecclesiastical questions of the day.

It is evident, then, that contented acquiescence with the old state of things already belongs to the past, and that a return to it is impossible. We must perforce advance, for good or ill, in the path of Revision, and cannot even materially slacken the pace nor defer the crisis. One choice, however, is left in our power, and that is the most important of all, namely, the direction which Revision shall take—that of conservative and recuperative addition, or that of further evisceration, ceremonial or doctrinal.

At the outset, we are met by a very weighty and significant fact, that the position of the Anglican Book of Common Prayer as a lay manual of devotion is unprecedented and unparalleled. Broadly speaking, and with certain deductions which it is unnecessary to state here, the Church of England is the only historical Church which has retained in any real sense the ancient notion of congregational and responsive worship. The authorised public formularies of other Churches are in strictness intended for the clergy alone. In the three greatest ancient Christian communions, Latin, Greek, and Russian, the service-books are not even in the vernacular tongue, nor are they obtainable at a cheap rate in their complete form. Roman Catholic laics can indeed, at least in the

British Isles, procure the abridged 'Missal for the Laity' in English; but there is no English Breviary accessible to them, nor even a complete Day Hours. They have Vesper Books, no doubt, but these are designed only for Sundays and festivals, and make no provision for daily worshippers in ferial seasons. Generally, a Roman Catholic at church is equipped with a manual, 'Gebetbuch,' 'Paroissien,' 'Garden of the Soul,' 'Vade Mecum,' or the like, which does not even profess to contain the service which the priest is reciting, except the Canon and Ordinary of the Mass, but which provides other devotions which the worshippers may employ simultaneously and in union with the orisons of the Church. Much may be said for and against this well-nigh universal practice in the Latin communion, according as the critic's point of view is the advantage of variety and of letting people pray in words which suit them individually, rather than tying them down to a stereotyped form, above the capacity of many; or the evil of allowing them to sever themselves in any degree from the corporate service of praise, and to keep permanently on the far lower religious level of modern emotional prayers, often of very doubtful theological colour, rather than make the salutary effort of rising to the loftier height of the immemorial collects of the Petrine Liturgy. But either way, the result is that the books in current use are not the authorised formularies of the Latin Church, but mere private ventures, approved by more or fewer ecclesiastics. Greek lay Catholics cannot be said to have any manual of prayer at all, for the 'Synopsis,' a meagre little volume, somewhat resembling the 'Garden of the Soul,' has not any formal authority whatever, except such as attaches to those portions of it which are simple excerpts from the service-books of the Church. But every member of the Church of England who can read, or who is even a rare occasional attendant at public worship, possesses the whole of the offices canonically and statutorily authorised by his Church, and if he be moderately devout, is tolerably familiar with all those parts of it which belong to her more ordinary ministrations, with a fair general notion of the remainder, and this not only from personal use, but from the continuous operation of a tradition of at least two centuries. Therefore, in any serious retouching of the Prayer-Book, it is not merely the official manual of a priesthood which is to be dealt with, but the volume which contains the devotions known and acceptable to the millions of Anglican layfolk. And although there is small cause to apprehend the generation of such a perfectly unreasonable schism as that of

the Starovertzski, or Old Believers, in Russia, who seceded in protest against the Patriarch Nikon's correction of errors which had crept into the service-books through the carelessness of successive copyists and printers, yet there is little doubt that much disquiet and distress might very easily be occasioned to many thousands of devout, but not highly active minds—a price which would be too dear to pay for merely literary and æsthetic improvement.

Another aspect of the question is that the Book of Common Prayer is, at last, the joint heritage and bond of all the competing schools included within the pale of the Church of England. When it is remembered how long, persistent, and embittered the resistance of one of those parties to even the minimum of conformity was from 1549 till about 1740; and how much more recent is the change of front which now induces it to speak in language of admiration and affection, not to be too invidiously or minutely scrutinised, concerning 'our incomparable and Scriptural Liturgy;' and when also the importance of possessing a formulary which the whole Broad Church school is willing to use, is considered: the more clearly it will appear that doctrinal revision in any direction, however commendable in itself, is highly perilous, and the almost certain solution of unity would be poorly compensated by a slight increase of orthodoxy, however that term might be interpreted. The Communion office of the Book of Common Prayer is a very crucial case in point. Viewed exclusively from the standpoint of the theologian and liturgiologist, it is a lamentable declension from the First Book of Edward VI., itself but meagre compared with the earlier Liturgies whence it was derived, and it contrasts unfavourably in some respects even with the Scottish and American rites. Here would seem to be a most unquestionable object of Revision, if only such qualities as those of fulness and beauty are to be considered. But the ecclesiastical statesman must take a wider survey, and will necessarily come to a different conclusion. He will recognise that with all the indisputable faults of the English Communion office, it is nevertheless a perfectly valid form, constituted in the main of the very same elements as its Sarum original, however transposed in order, and widely unlike the rites employed at the Communion by the Nonconformist bodies.¹

¹ There are *thirty-one* items common, literally or substantially, to the Ordinary and Canon of the Sarum Missal and the Communion Office of 1662. The only one direct point of contact between these two rites and the Middleburgh Puritan Prayer-Book of 1586, the Directory of 1644, or

That being so, and the history of the violent resistance to it as a 'mumbled Mass' being familiar to all students of Tudor and Stewart Church annals, it would be the height of unwisdom to afford any excuse for the renewal of such a strife, seeing that the very school which once endeavoured to oust this Communion Service altogether, now contentedly acquiesces in it, although their theological views on the subject, far from rising in the interval, have for the most part sunk from the comparatively spiritual and supernatural theory of Calvin to the Zwinglian rationalism of a bare commemorative ceremony, chiefly valuable as a public notification on the part of the communicants that they unite in accepting certain doctrines. It is so great a gain that no practical divergence of opinion exists in the Church of England as to the words of the Eucharistic office, whatever controversies there may be as to its doctrine and ceremonies, that scarcely any improvement in structure or theological expression which might alienate some, perhaps many, could be put for a moment in the opposite scale.

These two main difficulties are so serious and complicated that they would entirely warrant the indefinite postponement of the whole question of Revision, were it practicable. But, as already stated, it is upon us, it is actually being worked out piecemeal, and not very wisely, and it is inevitable, for a reason which has not been yet named. The Anglican Communion is no longer the religious system of a mere moiety of the population of the southern part of one small island, but a powerful federation of Churches spread over Europe, Asia, Africa, America, Australasia, and Polynesia, and ministering to flocks widely diverse in culture, in language, in habits, and in race. Even in England itself, the conditions of clerical work have changed largely within living memory. On the one hand, the tendency of the island to become an aggregate of great towns, with just country enough left for suburbs, has made the task of the urban incumbent one of extraordinary difficulty, owing to the massing together in a very narrow area of numbers far too great to admit of individual acquaintance, such as is fairly possible in small agricultural parishes. On the other, men the Scottish Presbyterian Liturgy of the same date, is the recitation of the words of Institution; which are, however, entirely dissociated in these latter formularies from any prayer said over the bread and wine. The common materials of Sarum and the Book of 1662 will be found tabulated at p. 23 of Mr. Grueber's recent Letter to the Bishop of Bath and Wells, on *The Sacrificial Altar and the Communion Table*. (London: James Parker & Co., 1876.)

are just waking up to the recognition that a considerable part of the rural population is in a state of sheer heathen ignorance as to religion and morals, and that, seemingly, not bettered, but rather worsened, by such influence as Primitive Methodism exerts, whether in Cornwall or Yorkshire. It is clearly unpractical to offer home or foreign pagans the refined and intellectual Book of Common Prayer, and it only, as their guide and manual of devotion. The mere mechanical difficulty of finding the places is enough to baffle most of them, without the additional perplexity of trying to understand the matter when found. Some more elementary, simply constructed, and flexible offices, or skeletons of offices, permitting almost any degree of modification, seem needful for the wants of such classes, for whom the Mission-room must serve as the porch and school of the church, just as the scattered synagogues of ancient Palestine were employed to train the Jews into familiarity with the liturgical system of the central Temple at Jerusalem.

Yet another reason for Revision in the direction of recovery presses itself very forcibly on our attention. It has been the differentiating peculiarity of the Oxford movement of 1833, as compared with the two religious revivals which preceded it in England, that it alone attempted to deal at once and corporately with the Church as a whole. Wesley's revival was to a large extent, even in his own prime of manhood, beside, if not outside, the Established Church, and made no attempt whatever to influence it collectively, otherwise than by persuading as many Churchmen, clerical and lay, as possible to embrace the particular tenets which he preached. Very similarly the Evangelical revival of Scott, Venn, and Romaine, though more really within the Established Church than its stronger precursor, never so much as seemed to touch the question of Church reform or resuscitation. The only way in which the matter presented itself to the minds of the leaders of that school, then or since, was the multiplication of pulpits whence their special views might be expounded; and to them belongs the creation of proprietary chapels, patronage trusts, and societies whose aid is strictly confined to the members of their own section, as distinguished from any endeavour to be conterminous with the Church itself.

Besides this, the Broad Church school, though more interested theoretically in the Established Church, as an element of national life, than the Evangelicals are or have been, has never passed as a body out of the literary into the active stage. It is still, for practical purposes, where the Oxford

movement was during the first three or four years of the *Tracts for the Times*, and therefore its direct action upon the Church is still a thing of the future. But, as said above, the Tractarian movement began from an entirely different starting-point, that of the corporate life of the Church, and not that of the individual mind or soul. The immediate and necessary result was the inception of a great variety of reforms and resuscitations, often crude, hasty, indiscreet, palæozoic, and incredibly foolish; but all of them testifying to the working of a powerful and widely-spread idea, pregnant with vitality, and finally issuing in the extraordinary change which has passed over the Church of England during the last forty years, filling it with life and vigour in every vein and muscle, and lifting it to a pinnacle of general respect, such as it certainly had not enjoyed since the thirteenth century. There is no more forcible way of stating the facts than by citing a celebrated document drafted and published last year by the most determined and persistent opponents of the Oxford movement, and signed by many others who are far from being its well-wishers:—‘We acknowledge, humbly and thankfully, the mercies vouchsafed by Almighty God to the Church of England. By His blessing on the labours of the clergy and laity, our Church has of late been enabled, in a marvellous manner, to promote His glory, and to advance His kingdom, both at home and abroad. If we judge by external signs—the churches built, restored, and endowed during the last forty years, the new parishes formed in that time, especially in our great towns and cities, the vast sums of money voluntarily contributed for the promotion of religious education, the extension of the Church in the Colonies and in foreign countries, including the foundation of more than fifty new sees—the great increase in the number of persons of all classes who, by prayer and labour, assist in the work of converting souls to Christ—all bear witness to the zeal and earnestness of the clergy and laity of the English Church.’¹ The very circumstance that in the immediately succeeding paragraphs of the document here cited, an attack is made on the one school whose sole work this great revival is, and an attempt made to rouse popular suspicion and disturbance against its most zealous and self-denying members, makes this testimony, with its precision of date, synchronising exactly with the beginning of the Oxford movement, all the more valuable and irrefutable. But one outcome of all these

¹ Declaration of the Archbishops and twenty-four Bishops at Lambeth, March 1, 1875.

reforms and revivals has been the desire to mark several of them with special religious services. The era of the Reformation, counting from the civil supremacy of the Zwinglo-Calvinist party in 1550, till the beginning of the Laudian reaction about 1633, was mainly one of destruction. Very many churches, not a few of them stately and magnificent structures, were recklessly destroyed for the sake of their materials, and without even that pretext of a desire to provide for the wants of necessitous districts which affects to veil decently the similar proceedings of our own day in the City of London; while it is difficult to find a dozen churches in all England to set beside St. John's, Leeds, as examples of church-building between the reigns of Henry VIII. and Charles II. It is not surprising, therefore, that no Office for the consecration of churches makes part of our accredited formularies, and that Lancelot Andrewes was obliged to compile one for himself. The Puritan school made something very like a public rejoicing over the partial destruction of Old St. Paul's by fire in June, 1561, and was not backward in expressing a wish that the remaining cathedrals might suffer a similar fate, as indeed Coventry had done at Henry VIII.'s hands not very long previously. As to church plate and goods of all kinds, there was far more done in the way of embezzlement and secularisation than of fresh gifts during the sixteenth century; 'insomuch that many private men's parlours were hung with altar-cloths, their tables and beds covered with copes, instead of carpets and coverlids; and many made carousing cups of the sacred chalices, as once Belshazzar celebrated his drunken feast in the sanctified vessels of the Temple. It was a sorry house, and not worth the naming, which had not somewhat of this furniture in it, though it were only a fair large cushion made of a cope or altar-cloth to adorn their windows, or make their chairs appear to have somewhat in them of a chair of state.'¹ That there should be no authorised forms for the dedication of church utensils and furniture is, therefore, not more wonderful, and it would be equally unreasonable to look for ordinations and benedictions of subordinate helpers in the vineyard as a literary product of the age which saw the suppression of the monasteries and the practical abolition of minor Orders.

But the religious spirit of the present time, amidst much that is to be deprecated, is to a great extent one of bountiful

¹ Heylyn, *Hist. Reform.* s. a. 1553.

giving, both of person and goods, for Church purposes, and the feeling is almost universal that some kind of precomposed offices to mark various occasions of the sort are desirable, that they may neither be passed over without notice, nor left to the vagaries of individual caprice. A very thoughtful writer, Dr. George MacDonald, wrote the following words several years ago in one of his most suggestive novels, *David Elginbrod*: 'Having, although a Scotchman, had an Episcopalian education, Hugh could not help rejoicing that not merely the Bible, but the Church Service as well, had been fixed beyond the reach of such degenerating influences, which had operated on the more material embodiments of religion; for otherwise such would certainly have been the first to operate, and would have found the greatest scope in any alteration. We may hope that nothing but a true growth in such religion as needs and seeks new expression for new depth and breadth of feeling will ever be permitted to lay the hand of change upon it—a hand, otherwise, of desecration and ruin.'

Now, this condition preliminary to salutary Revision has in fact been fulfilled since these words were written, since it is the distinguishing mark of the religious feeling which is now permeating and moulding the English Church, that it does need and seek new expression for new depth and breadth of feeling, and that chiefly in the channels of intercession, dedication, and thanksgiving, all of them but poorly provided for in the Book of Common Prayer.

Such are the principal *à priori* arguments for and against undertaking Revision at all, and it would seem, on weighing them together, that the scale of action is the heavier. The reasons against Revision are certainly adequate against certain kinds of Revision, but do not affect such changes as are purely occasional, supplementary, and optional; at any rate, not in at all so considerable a degree. Moreover, the nature of the desirable changes may all be inferred from a consideration of the special weakness of the Prayer-Book. That weakness consists in trying to cover a vast area with a very limited quantity of material.

It was shrewdly observed, several years ago, in some searching criticisms of the Poor Law system in this country, that the cause for the almost universal shortcomings, not to say failure, of the workhouses, was not to be sought in any special parsimony, harshness, or incompetence of guardians and officials, but in the sheer physical impossibility of conducting so many different processes with one staff under a single roof.

For the workhouse ordinarily attempts to unite in itself the dissimilar and incongruous functions of a refuge for aged poor, an infirmary, a lunatic asylum, a lying-in hospital, a school, a casual ward, and a penitentiary. No single machinery could deal adequately with such a complex institution, and efficiency can be had only by means of partition. Now, the aim of the compilers of the English Prayer-Book bears a strong likeness to that of the authors of the workhouse system. They have tried to make one small volume do the work of several. The Prayer-Book and Lectionary together make up the whole authoritative religious formularies of the Church of England, with the single exception of the Coronation Office. The smallest number of volumes to which those of the Latin Church can be reduced is four, namely, Missal, Breviary, Ritual, and Pontifical. The Greek office-books, omitting minor items, fill eighteen quartos. We have an unquestionable gain in simplicity, compactness, cheapness, and general diffusion, for while, as observed above, every layman who is an effective member of the Church of England at all, and who can read, possesses the Anglican formularies in their entirety, or can buy them for twopence if he have not got them already, no Greek or Roman layman, unless a professed student of liturgical subjects as a branch of learning, or a collector of books in general, so much as dreams of procuring the formularies of his Church, or could do it without a relatively large outlay, and indeed in the case of the Greek or Russian Church, an absolutely large one.

So far this is pure gain to the Anglican Church. But when we turn to the reverse of the medal, it is evident that the resulting losses are considerable, if not preponderant. The Prayer-Book undertakes the task of being at one and the same time all to the Reformed Church of England that the Missal, the Breviary, the Ritual, the Pontifical, and the Enchiridion were to the pre-Reformation Church; and if it really did succeed in the effort, it would be a miracle of compression and arrangement. But as a fact, it breaks down more or less signally in every one of these attempts. The matter is not to be looked at as though the compilers of the Prayer-Book did not intend to make such an effort, but designedly cast aside more or fewer of these earlier service-books altogether. This is true as regards the Hymnal, the Gradual, and the Processional, so that, if it once be conceded that the reasons for abolishing them were adequate, no fault can be found with the Prayer-Book for failing to supply their places. But the contents of the Prayer-Book show clearly that it was

designed to be in the stead of all the other chief service-books, and to include their most valuable features. Yet a very brief inquiry will show that the omissions are so very numerous and serious as to hamper the Church in many respects, and to stint the spiritual nutriment of devout souls.

So far as the Prayer-Book is the Breviary, or daily office-book of the Church of England, the first most obvious difference between it and the older rite is that it provides for no more than two daily offices instead of eight. This result is achieved partly by fusion and partly by omission. The fusion is of Matins, Lauds, and Prime into Morning Prayer; and of another part of Matins (treated as Nocturns or Night Office), with Vespers and Compline, into Evening Prayer; while the Little Hours of Terce, Sext, and Nones are discarded.

As a matter of fact, the system of 'accumulation' (that is to say, the continuous recitation of two or more offices together, like the current English use of uniting Morning Prayer, Litany, and Holy Communion in one unbroken service) practically made the choir services but two daily at the time of the Reformation; and it may readily be conceded that the orderly recitation of all the Canonical Hours, each at its own appointed time, is inapplicable to parish churches now, and may well be unattainable outside the walls of a religious community. Nor would there be any useful purpose achieved by restoring the discarded offices to our service-book at the present time. When laxity has extended so far that it is well-nigh impossible to make the vast majority of the clergy comprehend that there is any practical meaning in their pledge at ordination, any valid moral or religious obligation to recite two services daily, when omission involves neither legal censure, pecuniary loss, nor professional disesteem; and when we note the entire failure of the Shortened Services Act to multiply daily services amongst those whose previous excuse often was the inconvenient length of the office; it will be sufficiently obvious that any attempted restoration of the Canonical Hours must needs be a dead letter if imposed by authority, though in fact their recitation as a voluntary devotion has been widely revived.

Nevertheless, the loss which we suffer from the abolition of the Breviary is not merely fanciful and antiquarian. The most obvious evil which it has wrought is one which the New Lectionary has expressly recognised as needing amendment, and has attempted to palliate, namely, the want of an alternative or second evening service, such as was always accessible when Vespers and Compline were two distinct offices. The later Evensong of our cities, by far the most popular service

with the church-going poor, is an Evangelical innovation which dates from the close of the last century, and which was violently opposed by the Episcopal Bench of that day as well as by all clergymen who disliked seeing work done by others which they did not attempt themselves, but feared they might be expected to do, if the example were set, and comparisons made. But it has long ago made its footing good, and is not likely to be dropped or altered for a generation or two at the very least.

Meanwhile, the problem remains unsolved of how to provide for the wants of two different congregations, partly consisting of the same persons, in one church on a single afternoon or evening. If the Evensong be simply iterated, nobody will come to both services, and so devotion on the part of the congregation will be checked, not to dwell on the weariness and formalism likely to affect the officiant if he have to repeat exactly the service he performed a few hours before. If the Litany be made the afternoon service, and Evensong put off till night, the difficulty is by no means over, for the Litany is not and cannot be a popular service, despite its great beauty and fulness, by reason of its wholly penitential and deprecatory tone, having no elements of praise or thanksgiving, and it is therefore conspicuously unfit for a use to which it is too often put, that of a children's service; united with public catechizing. And there is a further difficulty about Evensong itself. It is far too like Morning Prayer in structure not to create a difficulty with a class which is only just beginning to attend church, and which is all the less inclined to go thither on Sunday morning, because very nearly the same prayers in the very same order occur on both occasions, a fault not prominent in the pre-Reformation offices. A further question may be raised as to whether, apart from this objection, the office itself is not somewhat too complex and intricate in structure for the uneducated; and whether a brief form, based on the old Compline, with one Gospel lesson, would not be the simplest and most adequate solution, by reason of its more emphatically nocturnal character, and the manner in which it has been all but authoritatively set before members of the English Church, even since the Reformation, in the Primer and Horarium as the model for their household devotions at night. Several other competing suggestions have been made, on grounds which merit attention, but it is needless to labour the point here, as it is enough to show that the fusion of Vespers and Compline is not wholly a gain. The loss of the Little Hours has its mischievous side

also, chiefly in that there is now no service whatever available for a midday office, such as has been successfully worked in a few churches in the City of London, notably St. Ethelburga and St. Lawrence Jewry, during the short lull of traffic at meal time, and such as might be introduced at the same hour in agricultural districts. Some kind of makeshift has to be employed, generally the Litany, despite the practical objection already mentioned, and sometimes the *Te Deum*, which is too brief, and also too jubilant, to make the staple of a separate office. The Little Hours did, in their fashion, provide something more like what is wanted, and the reformed Gallican Breviaries of the last century are more useful models than the Sarum book for the purpose, by reason of the greater variety they have given to these short offices, by departing from the unchanging use of Psalm cxix. appointed for them alike by Salisbury and by Rome. It is worth while to digress for a moment to say that the problem with which the Gallican reform successfully grappled was to arrange the weekly recitation of the whole Psalter in such a fashion as not to make the office much longer on one day than another, as is the case in the Roman Breviary, where the Matin Psalms are set down in numerical order, with a few exceptions, from Psalm i. to Psalm cix. inclusive, so that Thursday, on which Psalm lxxviii. occurs, and Saturday, with Psalms civ.—cvii. included in its office, take a much longer time than the other days, the result being that these Psalms are almost never said, a much briefer office of the Blessed Sacrament being substituted on Thursdays, and one of the Blessed Virgin on Saturdays, even when the crowded Kalendar does not replace the long ferial office altogether by a short festival one.

The matter in hand, however, is not so much to revive in any strict sense the Little Hours, as to do with them much what was done in 1549 with the remaining part of the Breviary, namely, to construct out of them, or, indeed, out of any other suitable material, a new intercalary office between Morning and Evening Prayer, for mid-day use, wherever such a service seems desirable. The subject of our losses under this head is by no means exhausted even now. There are two features of the ancient Breviary which have so much merit and practical value in them that it is thoroughly worth while to consider whether they be not susceptible of wise reproduction. The first is that use of Responds, Verses, and Commemorations, whose abolition is complacently recorded in the Preface of the Book of Common Prayer. No doubt it had not only become extremely intricate, but the devotional poverty of the

Sarum Responds is such that it is little marvel they were ruthlessly cut away. And it may be questioned whether such a Scriptural reform of them as was achieved, for example, in Archbishop Lavergne de Tressan's Rouen Breviary, would have been possible at the time. If carefully reconsidered, they would add great beauty and stateliness to divine service in Cathedral and Collegiate churches, where a specially trained choir could sing them. But a more homely and utilitarian employment of them, at any rate for the Invitatory, suggests itself for congregations made up almost altogether of entirely illiterate persons, such as our missionaries gather round them in South Africa, India, and Polynesia. These people, according to our present method, are mere spectators and hearers of divine service, scarcely sharers in it. They cannot read, and they do not know the Psalms by heart. But they could very easily learn a short intercalary verse, whether Invitatory or Antiphon, and sing it congregationally between the verses recited by the choir. Suppose, for instance, that it is Christmas or Easter Day. As our office stands at present, it is not till the Proper Psalms are reached that there is the slightest difference observable between these jubilant festivals and Good Friday itself. And where there are no facilities for chanting the Psalms, the distinction, to an untrained mind, does not begin to show itself till the Second Lesson. In the ancient office, the difference between the two was emphasised at the very beginning, and sustained throughout, so that joy or sorrow was clearly marked, instead of both being toned down to the same key. The abundant use of hymns amongst us has no doubt powerfully diminished the practical operation of this very grave fault, but it must be remembered that the use of hymns at all is still illegal, that they are not provided nor recognised by authority, save in the Ordinal, that their revival in the modern Church of England is an extremely late innovation, resisted to the last by men whose contemporaries are still living, and that the successful attempt to make them subsidiary to the ecclesiastical seasons, and to fit them to particular days and occasions, is still more recent, and is, in truth, one of the many results of the Oxford movement, which has almost expelled the subjective hymn-books of the Nonconformist type from our churches. Let us then take the case of a Mission Station, where a Christian flock exists, with vernacular services, but as yet with no hymnal; or even a congregation of illiterate colliers or miners here in England. It would be at once possible to turn them into active participants in the service by teaching

them a short intercalary Antiphon or Respond. Let us take the Sarum Antiphon to *Nunc Dimittis* in the Compline of Christmas Day, and see what difference it would make to the *Venite*, if lustily sung by a congregation. The choir leads off :

'*Choir.*—Alleluia, the Word was made flesh, Alleluia ; and dwelt among us. Alleluia. Alleluia.

'O come, let us sing unto the Lord, let us heartily rejoice in the God of our salvation.

'*Congregation.*—Alleluia, the Word was made flesh, Alleluia ; and dwelt among us. Alleluia. Alleluia.

'*Choir.*—Let us come before His presence, &c.

'*Congregation.*—Alleluia, &c. ;'

and so on to the close.

It is possible that some yet more effectual way of making wholly uneducated people share actively in public worship may be devised, but this old path seems to have much in its favour. The other element where the Breviary might teach us something is in its Lessons or Readings. It is one of the greatest faults of our actual liturgical system that it at least appears to put the leaf above the fruit, in that it gives such great prominence to the Old Testament in large portions of it which have but a very incidental bearing upon Christianity, such as the wars of Israel and Judah, and those prophecies which had their entire fulfilment many centuries back in the overthrow of various heathen empires and kingdoms ; while, for the vast majority of our people, all Christian records end with the Acts of the Apostles, and all Christian teaching with the Epistles. Yet, if there be any continuous force in Our Lord's statement that John the Baptist, though greatest of the prophets, was yet less than the least in the Gospel Kingdom, the natural corollary must be that the sermons and treatises of eminent Christian teachers, and the lives of holy Christian men and women, ought also to be woven into the course of divine service for the instruction of the faithful, and not be left to the caprice of the learned, or the neglect of the unlearned, amongst the clergy. Now this the Breviary did and does try to do, not always successfully—indeed, in the case of the Sarum Breviary, with most disastrous failure—but still keeping it as an object in view. The system is easily explained. On ordinary week-days, there are three continuous readings at Matins from some one book of Scripture, each followed by its responsory. On Sundays and festivals, there are nine readings, three to each Nocturn of Matins. The first group of these consists on Sundays, as on week-

days, of three lessons from some one book of Scripture, according to the time of year; the second is a comment, from the writings of some canonised Father, most frequently S. Ambrose or S. Augustine, on the general subject of these lessons; and the third group consists of the Gospel of the day (now abridged to its first verse), followed by three extracts from a homily on that Gospel by some other Saint, notably S. Chrysostom, S. Gregory, and Venerable Bede. On Saints' days, the First Nocturn lessons are chosen with some reference, more or less obvious, to the kind of commemoration; the Second Nocturn usually consists of a short biography of the personage commemorated, too often so legendary and puerile, even after the wholesale sweep which Pius V. made of such matter, that a French proverb runs, 'He lies like the second nocturn:' while the Third Nocturn follows the Sunday rule, and gives the Gospel of the day illustrated by a patristic gloss.

There does seem a basis here for working on wisely, for it surely cannot be well that the most devout and beautiful writings of the most eminent Christian Saints should be restricted to the learned, and that those to whom the Church reads publicly the annals of Saul, of Rehoboam, and of Ahab, should know nothing, even by rumour, of Polycarp, of Cyprian, and of Athanasius. Who, if free from a traditional prejudice, would deny that a devout but unlettered soul would derive more profit and comfort from hearing the *Imitation of Christ* read in church rather than the Book of Ecclesiastes, and feel more interest in the letter of the Church of Smyrna containing the narrative of S. Polycarp's martyrdom, than in the war between Joash and Amaziah? No doubt, the task of choice would be a most delicate and difficult one, but the resolute ignoring of all Christianity subsequent to the Acts of the Apostles is not an unmixed gain to our formularies. So much for the Breviary, though the mere surface only of the subject has been touched.

Now let us see what our losses are in so far as the Prayer-Book is our Missal, leaving out of account altogether doctrinal questions on which there is a divergence of opinion within the Established Church, and even faults of structure as compared with the earlier rites. In the first place, all the Epistles and Gospels for the week-days of Advent, and the Collects, Epistles, and Gospels for the week-days of the first five weeks in Lent, and for the Ember Days, are gone, together with the Holy Week Collects previous to Good Friday, and with them all the Commons for minor festivals other than red-

letter days. In the next place, all the special Eucharistic offices are gone too. Nothing is provided for save the ninety Sundays and chief holydays of the Reformed Kalendar, and apart from the drawback of iteration of the same Collects, Epistles, and Gospels all through each week, where celebrations are frequent, the Church is at present cut off from all lawful means of giving any particular emphasis to special needs or occasions. A newly-married couple desires to receive the Holy Communion at the wedding. There is no proper Collect, Epistle, Gospel, or Post-Communion for the purpose, which may usefully teach a lesson at such a time. Nor are mourners at a funeral better provided for, nor travellers going on a long and perilous journey, nor yet confirmation candidates. Public objects are not more regarded than private ones, since there is nothing for harvest, for war-time, for seasons of pestilence or famine, for synods, nor indeed for any of the many scores of occasions which will readily suggest themselves. In truth, one of the great weaknesses of the Prayer-Book is in its Collects, whose number is relatively very small, and whose provision for particular needs is highly inadequate. All the separate petitions in the Book of Common Prayer, omitting the Our Father and iterated Collects, but including benedictions and thanksgivings, amount to 173. The *Manual of the Association for Intercessory Prayer*, containing nothing but petitions for special needs of various kinds, has 294 Collects; Canon Bright's *Ancient Collects*, second edition, has 568; and the fifth edition of the *Priest's Prayer-Book* has 688—a discrepancy which, after all deductions for tautology and redundancy, certainly suggests the existence of many very serious gaps in our formularies. A more startling fact discloses itself on further inquiry. Out of the 173 Collects and prayers in the Common Prayer-Book, no more than *eight* are thanksgivings. Considering that the very word 'Eucharist' means 'thanksgiving,' it does seem that more of this element should be introduced into our Communion office, and that the just reproach of thanklessness as a Church, to which the astounding ratio above set down exposes us, should be wiped away; that we may not remain dumb, as now, when we have special cause for public acknowledgment of Divine favours and benefits. It would be well to place all the new intercessions and thanksgivings along with the existing ones after the Litany, but to append a rubric authorising the use of them in the Communion office as well as at Morning and Evening Prayer.

As regards the Ritual, the most obvious loss of all is that of the Apostolic, if not Divine, institution of Unction of the

Sick, which might have been reformed instead of abolished, and after which the Tunkers and Peculiar People are wistfully groping. It is difficult to defend our departure as a Church from a Scriptural precept which is so express, and which every other historical Church has its way of observing. Of course we do not forget the distinction between the Scriptural anointing of the sick and the Roman unction of the dying; the former a symbolical medicine for the body, the latter only regarding the soul, and so supplanting *viaticum*. Neither do we overlook the difficulty of authoritatively reviving it after such long disuse and in the teeth of a prejudice so great as perhaps to compel delay. But this objection does not lie against other restorations from the Ritual, such as a service for the Burial of Children, for whom our existing office is altogether inappropriate; one for laying the first stone of a new church, and for dedicating and setting apart ornaments or utensils designed for Divine service. As to the Pontifical, it has been already noticed that our Bishops are compelled to travel outside the Prayer-Book by the exigencies of our time. In consecrating churches and cemeteries, in ordaining Readers, in the institution of Incumbents, and in reopening churches after restoration, they all but universally employ forms which have no legal authority whatsoever, and cannot be lauded very highly on their own merits. Besides these, there are varying local uses in our cathedrals for the enthronement of a new Bishop, and for the installation of Deans and Canons. It would be better that these and various cognate forms should be agreed on in common, and be universally accessible, rather than retain their present private, varying, and informal character. And there can be little doubt that, while the short penitential offices borrowed from the old Enchiridion, and recast for private use in the post-Reformation Primer, are devout, practical, and capable of being profitably revived for public worship, on the other hand it is certain that we are singularly devoid of offices suitable for Lent or penitential seasons generally. True, we have the Communion office, but it belongs to a single day and that alone, and while of eminent value as a witness, its use and usefulness are obviously limited.

These are, generally speaking, the chief gaps which need filling. The next point to consider is what may be taken away from the existing body of matter, with the least possible disturbance or loss. There is very little indeed which can be retrenched in so concise a formulary as the Prayer-Book, but it is probable that no serious injury to devotion would attend

the excision of the Easter Tables. If to these we add the various short homiletic exhortations found in the Prayer-Book, and intended originally to meet a merely temporary need, that of enabling an unlearned clergy to explain the intentions of the new vernacular service to a laity which had been used to Latin prayers, and had thus never thought of trying to follow the officiant's words, we shall have named nearly all that can be wisely struck out. This original need has entirely passed away, and the exhortations now, even when listened to, are no help whatever to devotion, and do but break the continuous flow of the service.

Omission, after all, is an easy task, and so is even accretion, in view of the copious materials which are in our hands. But there remains a far more delicate and difficult process, on which a few words must be said, that of correction, which, in strictness, alone is truly Revision, involving alterations of matter which is retained. It is here that the battle of party rages, and that the utmost tact, charity, and foresight become necessary. Two facts have been made abundantly plain by comparatively recent events, and they are that neither the Broad Church nor the Low Church school can be trusted with the work. So far as the former has given any clue to its probable course, in the language of Dr. Colenso, in the posthumous *Psalms and Litanies* of the late Dr. Rowland Williams, and in a volume of *Unsectarian Prayers* recently published by Mr. H. R. Haweis, it would do nothing but follow in the steps of an Arianised, or rather Socinianised, Common Prayer-Book issued by the Unitarians in 1852, as 'adapted for use in other Protestant Churches.' A less extreme section makes the abortive revision of 1689 its basis, and in the main accepts the American changes, save in the Communion office, but the class which such alterations would satisfy is far smaller than that which they would irritate.

Change for mere change's sake is to be deprecated on all grounds, change which is intended to win over opponents or to prevent the withdrawal of friends deserves respectful consideration, but the history of the American Church and the present attitude of English Nonconformists prove clearly enough that such alterations as are proposed with either of these alleged objects would make no practical impression on outsiders, while they would very seriously distress the majority of those within.

As for the Evangelical school, it has three times within the last very few years been able to show us on what principles of revision it would proceed if unfettered. First comes a syn-

cretist Book of Common Prayer, 'prepared for use in the Evangelical Churches, by ministers and members of the Established and Nonconformist Churches. London, 1867.' Next are the changes introduced by the new Cumminsite sect in the United States, calling itself the Reformed Protestant Episcopal Church. Thirdly come the proposals and the achievements of the Revisionist party in the disestablished Church of Ireland. And to each and all of these Dr. Mac Donald's words cited above will apply: their hand is one of desecration and ruin. It would be difficult, with the best intentions on their part, that it should be otherwise. On the one hand, their school has never grasped the idea of Worship at all, and keeps, as its one notion of the end of religious assemblies, the edification of the persons assembled, and not the rendering of public homage to God, prominently before it. On the other, it never has viewed Christianity as a historical religion, and has seldom accepted, even partially, the sacramental system which is inextricably interwoven in the structure of the Prayer-Book, but which conflicts largely with Calvinism, and wholly with Zwinglianism; and therefore must be hacked away at any cost, if the Prayer-Book is to be harmonised with the current theology of Evangelicals.

Consequently, in these three examples we have cited, nothing whatever has been done towards enriching, beautifying, or elevating the Prayer-Book, nor towards increasing its plasticity, so as to make it more suitable than now for differing classes of worshippers. The only thing attempted is to retrench ceremonies whose meaning the revisers did not understand, and to erase doctrines which, although of immemorial prevalence in the Church Universal, they did not believe. They must be held, therefore, to have failed entirely, since these changes, even if more could be said for them on their own merits, are altogether distasteful to a large and more cultivated majority. The task falls thus by default into High Church hands, and it remains to be considered how it may be carried on with the least friction possible, and rather to promote the advantage of the Anglican Church at large than to secure a technical victory for one of its schools over the others.

The preliminary condition essential to any amicable settlement is the frank abandonment of the chimera of an absolutely rigid uniformity, which the authorities of the Church of England have pursued with little wisdom and less profit from the first Statute of Uniformity in 1549 till the Public Worship Regulation Act of 1874. Uniformity is a very questionable good in itself, even if it be attainable, as it certainly cannot

be in the Church of England while her competing schools bear anything like their present ratio to one another. Above all, to fix narrow limits on either side in the present crisis of transition, when the Church is full of young vigorous life, and is pushing out in every direction, would be a grave error of policy, sure to result only in the violent snapping of the unaccustomed ligatures, and in the further shattering of the very ramshackle discipline of the Church of England. We have only to look back about thirty years, and to reflect what would be the result now, had the authorities done at that time what was urged upon them by the rigidly conservative clergy, and prohibited by law all deviations from the customary norm of public worship as it was in 1840. Not to go into any sort of minute detail, it is enough to say that surpliced choirs and choral services in parish churches, the employment of the offertory, and the division of the three Sunday morning services would have been forbidden. While there is such a powerful spirit of devotional reform and amendment still operating amongst us, we are no more capable of saying in 1876 what will be wanted and done in 1900 than Archbishop Howley could guess in 1842 what is received everywhere without scruple now, however clamorously assailed and denigrated when first presented as an innovation. It is absolutely necessary, therefore, that all changes, no matter how obviously for the better, should be neutralised, so far as party is concerned, by being made optional and not compulsory. Take for example the now common and seemingly custom of formally admitting a new chorister. As a minor officer of public worship, it is clearly fit that he should be constituted by the local authority, and it is better, as a matter of practical expediency, that the brief form required should be used in church rather than in a vestry or schoolroom. But many clergymen would see no advantage in the usage, and therefore it ought not to be forced on them. All that is needed is that the authorities should license a form for those who like to use it, and that the Act of Uniformity should be relaxed so as to protect such use from penal consequences. And not less consideration should be shown for such as might feel reluctant to adopt substantive changes in the existing offices, however strongly recommended. It should be open to them to go on using the old book, exactly as they still may do with the old Lectionary, and the changes ought not, at any rate for the present, to be on so extensive a scale as to antiquate the existing Prayer-Books, and thus throw out congregations accustomed to them alone from childhood.

Another rule, which has the merit of avoiding newfangledness, and of keeping to historical precedent, is to work back mainly on the lines of the First Book of Edward VI. Meagre as it is in many respects, and by no means an ideal formulary, it yet stands on a very much higher level than the unfortunate Book of 1552, which wrought such wanton havoc, and from which the successive Books of 1559, 1604, and 1662 have been reactions and recoveries. By adopting the same method of gradual restoration, we shall follow the tradition of Parker, of Andrewes, and of Cosin, and keep to Anglican usage without unnecessary deviation. It may be added in this place that a petition to the Convocation of Canterbury, that any revision of the Prayer-Book may take the Book of 1549 as its guide, was presented not long ago from eighteen thousand laymen, headed by the Duke of Marlborough, and that the late Mr. Keble lent his aid to a movement for the revival of the Communion office of 1549, on a co-ordinate footing with the existing rite. Nevertheless, our liturgical knowledge and our practical experience are far greater than those of the compilers of the Book of 1549, and it would be mere narrow archaism to follow them blindly, wherever we have learnt a more excellent way.

Taking the desirable amendments in their order as they stand in the Prayer-Book, the first thing to note is the revision of the Kalendar. Many ingenious theories and apologies in its defence as it now stands have been made, but after all, the selection of black-letter days does not adequately fulfil the real object of such commemorations, which is to keep in memory the greatest names in Christian history, and to bring their examples before the people at set times for their edification. This principle, consistently acted on, would not load the Kalendar with a multitude of names of all degrees of celebrity, as is the case with the Greek and Roman Churches, but would choose only famous and typical examples, excluding all that is obscure, doubtful, or legendary. There are days in our Kalendar as it now stands which might give way to a select group of more famous names, or more trustworthy events, for commemoration, from which it would be feasible to give practical instruction to the people. The New Testament would give us back SS. Zacharias and Elizabeth, S. Timothy, S. Titus, S. Joseph of Arimathea, S. Lazarus, S. Salome. The East would give us S. Basil the Great, S. John Chrysostom, S. Gregory Nazianzen, S. Polycarp, S. Ignatius of Antioch, S. Athanasius, S. Cyril of Jerusalem. Our own annals in these islands would yield the names of men who

did much for Christianity amongst us, as S. Aidan, S. Aelred, S. Benedict Biscop, S. Anselm, S. Alcuin, S. Columba, S. Ninian, S. Theodore of Tarsus, S. Osmund, S. Patrick, and S. Cuthbert; while for the remainder of the Western Church, we could fill up the list with the memories of S. Irenæus, S. Leo the Great, and S. Bernard, even if many other equally illustrious names be excluded on controversial grounds. All these are drawn from various old English Kalendars, are pregnant with teaching, and are less open to plausible objections than many of what we have. It would be well, also, to lift the two black-letter feasts of Our Lord, the Transfiguration and the Holy Name, to red-letter rank, and give them a proper Collect, Epistle, and Gospel; unless, indeed, as regards the latter, it be considered as sufficiently provided for by the Feast of the Circumcision. The New Lectionary may very well be taken as a basis for further revision, on the lines laid down by the Bishop of Lincoln, but with the important addition of lessons from the Books of Maccabees, whose teaching is full of valuable matter, recording as they do the rising of a nation against a heathen yoke, and the restoration of the worship of the true God. And it might form suitable matter for inquiry whether groups of Common Lessons for minor festivals might not be profitably drawn up, one applying to martyrs, another to great Christian teachers, a third to successful missionaries, and so on.

Next, it would be a distinct gain to begin Morning and Evening Prayer as in Edward VI.'s First Book, with the Our Father, omitting the present clumsy and non-liturgical reading of sentences, and the Exhortation. But it would be well to retain one feature of our present Book which is absent from that of 1549, albeit found in the older offices, namely, Confession and Absolution, although the briefer and simpler wording of the Sarum Prime and Compline, in which the rite is double, as the priest confesses to the people, who respond with a precatory absolution, might be very wisely and profitably substituted for the existing compositions, and with no shock to any one's conscience; but, on the contrary, great relief to those who scruple at what they consider the sacerdotalism of the present use, yet who would find the priesthood of the laity fully recognised in the older form. The versicle, 'O Lord, open Thou our lips,' with its response, is rightly omitted from Evensong in the Book of 1549. It is unmeaning as it stands there in our Book, after our mouths have been open all day.

The question of Invitatories and Antiphons to the Psalms

has been treated above, and the principle of increasing the number of Proper Psalms has already been conceded, requiring now only general agreement, instead of diocesan variations. The difference between Morning and Evening Prayer might be wisely increased by additions to the group of suffrages after the second Our Father, from many of the beautiful versicles and responses to be found ready to our hands in several ancient Breviaries, or capable of being framed anew from Holy Scripture, and chiefly from the Psalms, thereby increasing the intercessory character of the services. And the present liberty of omitting *Benedictus* at Matins and *Magnificat* at Evensong ought to be withdrawn, simply on the ground that we have only three Gospel Canticles, but Psalms in plenty. It might be considered, however, whether some of the many noble Old Testament canticles outside the Psalter might not be wisely introduced into our service, as in the Mozarabic Breviary, which has no fewer than seventy-three of them. This might be easily done, for instance, by using some of them on the thirty-first day of the month, instead of iterating the Psalms of the previous day.

For reasons of charity, already discussed, it would be undesirable to precipitate any changes of importance in the Communion office. But some amendments are at once feasible without wounding any one—and the Scott Robertson petition in 1875 against the permissive use of the vestments and the Eastward position, signed as it was by almost the whole body of the Evangelical clergy,¹ warns us that Mr. Keble's hope that the Communion office of 1549 might again be legalised alternatively, cannot be realised in the present temper of that school; nor, consequently, any reforms that would approximate to such a result. We must be content with minor, but still salutary amendments, as useful in their degree as those made in 1662. First, then, some recognition of the difference between a choral celebration and a plain one of Holy Communion would be expedient, giving authority to sing an Introit, Hymns, and Anthems from Scripture in the courts of the office under the former condition, as also the traditional verse before and after the Gospel.

An attempt is being made to legalise an abuse common with the Evangelical party, of reciting the words of administration but once for a whole railful. Originally, the motive for

¹ There were 5,376 signatures to this address, almost exclusively drawn from the Evangelical clergy, who amount to about 5,000, but with a small sprinkling of men from other schools, such as Provost Hawkins of Oriel, and Canon Farrar, which accounts for the odd hundreds.

this deviation from the rubric was Calvinistic pravity, making the officiant unwilling to admit the applicability of the benefits of the Sacrament to every communicant. Now, it is probable that sheer sloth is the only reason. But this undesirable innovation can be readily stayed by a moderate concession, that of reverting to the First Book of Edward VI., and reciting only the prior half of the present form of administration. If something yet briefer be desired, it is practicable to fall back on the simplest, shortest, and earliest form known to us, that of the Clementine Liturgy, which is simply 'The Body of Christ,' 'The Blood of Christ,' with the response 'Amen.'

In a more healthy and settled state of the Church it ought to be the rule to have the entire Communion office performed or none of it. The mutilated rite is very unsatisfactory and it is to be feared that in too many instances it has contributed very largely to that disuse of the Holy Eucharist save at rare intervals, which is even now only slowly giving way to a better state of things. The second rubric, putting it in the power of a negligent priest to refuse a celebration at his pleasure, should be expunged; and the third, fixing a minimum of three communicants, has worked so badly, that already a relaxation of it has been recommended by the Lower House of Convocation of Canterbury. A direction that there must not be a solitary celebration, but that some one person at least must be present to respond and to represent the laity, would surely be enough. It should be assumed, though perhaps not enforced, by the rubric, that a weekly Eucharist is the parochial minimum, and that in Cathedrals and Colleges, where there are many priests, a higher standard should prevail, which would involve a change in the fourth of the group of rubrics. There needs an addition to the rubric which regulates the quality of the Bread. Nothing is said about the quality of the Wine, and the result is that a great deal of stuff which is not wine, and not even unfermented grape-juice, is used by careless, heterodox, or inexperienced clergymen. The common Rota Tent of commerce is scarcely a true wine, and there are worse compounds still in frequent use; nay, cases have lately occurred where an ancient heresy has been revived, and mere water been given in the chalice to teetotaller communicants.

On this follows an alteration which, as being of real practical moment, we are compelled to suggest. It is that the prohibition to carry the consecrated species out of church be suppressed in favour of a direction to the priest, based on that in the Communion of the Sick in 1549, to reserve the

Sacrament for sick Communion—a different thing, be it observed, from the Roman reservation for Adoration or Benediction. Charity towards those who suffer so severely under our present system ought surely, in a case like this, to override the unreasonable prejudices of those who object to this reform, which is founded on such a basis of right and expediency, that it is certain to make itself good before long. In times of severe epidemic, and in large parishes, our existing rubric causes numbers of persons to die without the last Sacrament, and there are several other minor, but still very grave inconveniences inseparable from Consecration in the sick-room, of which every experienced clergyman is aware. Objections are not always reasonable, and it is a curious illustration of the inverted logic of which some men are capable, that a speaker in the Lower House of Canterbury actually argued not long ago against the necessity of reservation for the sick, on the ground that a sick person, whom he was visiting, died before the Consecration was over, and thus uncommunicated. It is clear that whatever spiritual gain actual Communion might have been, would have been attained, had not the delay of consecrating been interposed, and this is exactly one of the strongest reasons for the reform.

Last of all, the Black Rubric on kneeling ought to go. Negative statements are entirely out of place in books of devotion, and as the Church of England managed to do without this particular one from 1559 to 1662, it may very well be expunged again, for though the heterodox savour of it as it stood in 1552 has been purged, yet even still it is popularly misconstrued, and lends itself too readily to Zwinglian error. There is nothing to be said in its defence, not even that it is theologically accurate even now.

The Baptismal offices need a rubric explaining to lay persons how to baptize in cases of emergency, as in the Book of 1549. They require revision on other grounds, but at a time when their fundamental doctrine is assailed, it would be unwise to create additional irritation by returning to better forms. There is much need of a formulary which will discharge that function for the Church of England which the *Shorter Catechism* does for Scottish Presbyterianism: not only teaching such primary tenets of religion as the being and attributes of God, the immortality of the soul, the work of Christ's life, the Last Judgment, the future state of reward or punishment, and so forth, but also the office of the Church, the commission of the Christian ministry, and much besides. The instinctive answer which many Churchmen will make

is that we have the Church Catechism. But this is at best only a Confirmation manual, and does not utter one syllable of explanation on any of the fundamental points named above, nor, curiously enough, save in its rubrics, on that very rite of Confirmation which it is designed to precede. In truth, there is, perhaps, no part of the Prayer-Book which needs to be both supplemented and extended more than the Catechism. Admirable as it is when viewed as a preparation for Confirmation, it is not therefore a substitute for that complete and authoritative summary of Christian teaching which a Church ought to possess. It does not profess to be such, neither is it. If it were so, to what end would be its large omissions of important Christian doctrines? to say nothing of its want of adaptation to the apprehension of young children. It is at least hard to believe that if we had possessed a *complete* catechism, such a large proportion of children brought up in Church schools would drop away to Dissent as actually do so. As it is, our children are not taught to answer the two questions, 'Why am I a Christian, and not an Infidel?' and 'Why am I a Churchman, and not a Dissenter?' Still less is there any instruction on the duties which are involved in professing yourself a Churchman. In fact, we need two or three graduated Catechisms, beginning with such elementary truths as are contained in Bishop Forbes' little *Catechism to be learnt before the Church Catechism*; ascending through Mr. Grueber's excellent *Catechism on the Church*, and closing with some fuller one, such as might be based on Mr. Sadler's *Church Doctrine, Bible Truth*, designed for teachers and senior classes in Sunday schools.

As to the Confirmation office, we are all familiar with the popular error that the object of the rite is for the candidates to confirm their vows, instead of for them to be confirmed by the Bishop, so that they are the active agents in it, and not the passive recipients. A simple remedy would be to return to the form of 1549, which is not open to any such misconception. If this be thought too sweeping, then the misleading word 'confirming,' in the question put to the candidates, might be struck out, and 'ratifying' allowed to stand alone. And the rubric needs expansion, to bar the slothful custom of confirming by railsful, which some Bishops practise, while it is equally necessary to make it clear that they have no right to fix a minimum age below which they refuse to confirm at all, even though the requirements of the rubric as to religious knowledge may be fully satisfied.

In the Marriage office, two things are lacking, one a minor

adornment, the other an important warning. The former is the benediction of the wedding-ring ; the latter a rubric, in face of the present law of divorce, stating plainly that the *guilty* party can in no wise contract Christian matrimony while the former partner survives, and that in no case can a divorced wife, whether appellant or respondent, re-marry while her former husband lives. If an adulterer choose to simulate marriage—' *Conjugium vocat, hoc prætexit nomine culpam* '—let him or her have recourse to the civil union provided by the State, which professes to dissolve that which is indissoluble, and not add sacrilege to profligacy by profaning Christian matrimony.

The Visitation office, besides omitting the Scriptural use of Unction, already referred to, falls far short of the ancient form in beauty and impressiveness, by the loss of the magnificent Commendation of the departing soul, which the very slightest retouching could make unassailable by prejudice itself, and which would prove most comforting to the mourners present. And on the recovery of reservation of the Sacrament for the sick, an additional form for its administration, properly fenced by explanatory rubrics, will be needed.

The stately beauty of the Anglican office for the Burial of the Dead has caused many, perhaps most, of even scholars who are familiar with it, to forget how signally it departs from the tone of more primitive Christian rites of sepulture, in that it contains only the most sedulously veiled intercession for the repose of the departed, which is the dominant idea in earlier forms. The abuses which accumulated round the doctrine of Purgatory, as popularly taught in the sixteenth century, and the scandals arising out of the traffic in Masses—scandals by no means extinct yet in the Latin Church, as recent trials in the French law courts have taught us—drew down punishment on the Church and nation of England by bringing about the total obscuring of the doctrine of the Intermediate State. Just so, some faultiness in the practical working of the Egyptian doctrine of judgment after death, followed by reward or punishment, substantially the same as that held by Christians now, must have led to its exclusion from Mosaic teaching, for scarcely a hint or trace of it is discoverable in the Old Testament, and its recovery cannot date before the Captivity. The Sadducee element is too strong in the English Church now to admit of any hasty re-introduction of intercession for the departed into our formularies, since it would arouse strife instead of increasing devotion, which may safely be left for the time to the pious instincts of individuals, content to believe as the later Jewish Church and the early Christian Church did, and to act

on their convictions. But two things are possible as improvements for the removal of practical difficulties attending the use of the Burial Service, so long as the Anglican clergy are compelled to act as national undertakers. One is the adoption of part of the Roman rubric, permitting the Christian burial of suicides of unsound mind, and forbidding, on the other hand, that of notorious apostates from Christianity, and of persons killed in a duel, as well as of such as died in open and flagrant sin, taking care, however, not to constitute the clergyman judge of such flagrancy. The other is to restore the Funeral Eucharist, refusing it in all cases save those of children and of *bonâ fide* communicant Church members, dying either as consistent or as penitent Christians. It is clear enough that the proposal to license an alternative Burial Service is useless, since the assignment of the inferior one in any case would all but invariably give deadly offence. But the Funeral Eucharist could not be claimed as a right by any one at Common Law, nor even as an indulgence by the friends of persons who refused to frequent the Eucharist while they lived, or who had given such grave scandal before their death as to make it certain that they might have been justly repelled from the Lord's table as 'open and notorious evil livers.' In this wise, a true and living discipline could be gradually restored, without coming into collision with the State in the matter of burials, or giving Nonconformists the triumph which they seek, should they succeed in forcing their way to equal tenure of those freeholds of the Church which they refuse to assist in maintaining, and do it too on such terms as would still leave the clergy liable to bury the corpses of those Dissenters whom their own pastors thought undeserving of religious privileges. This scheme, which is part of the Nonconformist programme, would be effectually checkmated in the way pointed out above, and it is more than doubtful if any other equally feasible solution of the difficulty be discoverable.

These are the main questions which need careful inquiry if the Revision of the Book of Common Prayer is to be anything more than an impotent tinkering. There may be,—indeed there must be,—much divergence of opinion as regards several of the later suggestions we have made, but it is to be noted that in all cases they at least aim at giving more dignity, fulness, beauty, and plasticity to the Prayer-Book, and at bringing its devotions to bear on a larger area of Christian acts.

Microscopic alterations of the rubric have not been discussed, and it has been taken for granted that the religious sense

of the community will continue to reject, as it has hitherto rejected, the efforts of the Liturgical Revision Society to mutilate the Baptismal office, the Visitation of the Sick, and the Ordinal; especially as so little proof has been yet adduced that any influx of outsiders into the Church would be the result of such excisions. The obvious answers to any such plea are that the hostility of Nonconformists to the Church of England is now political far more than theological, and cannot be allayed by liturgical changes; that no such results as those promised have followed from the unfortunate alterations made in the American Prayer-Book in an age of deep theological and liturgical ignorance, nor seem likely to follow from the less excusable manglings committed by the Irish Synod; and that as no monopoly exists in the Prayer-Book, such Nonconformists as like to use any portions of it can and do so already in their services, without being obliged to submit to any conditions or restrictions as its price, and will certainly not be bribed by the offer of dividing the living truth, and giving them half of its mutilated corpse. The Scottish Church in the last century tried the experiment of conciliation by the abandonment of liturgical order, in the hope of appeasing the hostility of Presbyterians, and was justly punished by losing a vast body of its own members to a Communion which differed little from it in externals, and had the advantage of State recognition. If we are ever to win back English Nonconformists to the Church, it is by making that Church more stately, beautiful, and attractive than their own societies, in other words, by following as our examples the Reformers of 1833, and sedulously shunning those of 1552.

ART. III.—ALEXANDER LYCURGOS, ARCHBISHOP
OF THE CYCLADES.

Report of his Grace the Archbishop of Syra and Tenos on his Journey to England. In the original Greek, with English Translation. (London: F. T. Cartwright.)

THE reputation of the late Archbishop of Syros in this country has been mainly due to his visit to England in 1870, and to his attendance, very shortly before his death, at the Bonn Conference of 1875. These occasions brought into strong relief some of the most striking features of his character, and especially his passionate desire for the unity of Christendom. But yet the history of his life, which we are now enabled to give in some detail as it was known to his own people, will show that it was not in these prominent events of his career that his true greatness was most conspicuous. The trials and difficulties, inseparable from the position of an Eastern ecclesiastic in the present century, were enhanced in the case of Alexander Lycurgos by peculiar circumstances; and he passed through them with a wisdom and singleness of purpose which enabled him to confer lasting benefits upon his church and country.

Of the special influences that were brought to bear upon him at different stages of his career, the earliest, as also the strongest, was the character of his father and the course taken by him during the Greek war of independence. The Archbishop's father was not only a Christian patriot, but one who might have claimed the higher title of confessor, from his devotion to the faith for which he endured sufferings that only stopped short of actual martyrdom. His name originally was George Lycurgos,¹ but he is chiefly remembered by that of Logothetes, from the office which he held for many years as lay representative of the Church to the Holy Synod. He was of a distinguished family in the island of Samos, and his history would have formed an interesting preface to that of

¹ The family name of the Archbishop is identical with that of the Spartan lawgiver Λυκοῦργος, and therefore the form in which we have given it above—a combination of Latin and Greek—is incorrect; but as it is the spelling which has been generally adopted in designating the Archbishop, we have thought it best to retain it.

his son ; but we have only space to explain that his whole life was devoted to the deliverance of his church and country from the Moslem yoke. Born in 1791, Logothetes had passed through long years of trial, repeatedly braving death for the cause of Christ, when on the proclamation of the independence of Greece he was appointed Governor-General of the island of Samos, then supposed to form part of the new kingdom. He seemed by that event to have attained all for which he had struggled, the welfare of the church and people in his native island being thus entrusted to himself ; but the decision of the European Powers, which gave Samos back to Turkey and to the Moslem rule, finally extinguished all his hopes. Bitterly disappointed, he retired for a time into a monastery to find solace in prayer and study, and then established himself with his family in Athens, where he was appointed Senator under the government of King Otho.

Logothetes had married in 1811 a Greek lady named Poulouditza Stamati, by whom he had nine children. At the present date two daughters only survive out of the whole number, Diamantina and Cleopatra.

Alexander, the future Archbishop, was born at Samos on November 4, 1826 ; and in him were soon centred the high hopes and pure ambition which in his own person Logothetes had failed to realise. The early death of his first-born son had caused him to fix his heart exclusively on the bright, intelligent boy, who was given to him just before the final failure of his hopes ; and throughout Alexander's childhood and youth his father used every means to fire him with his own patriotic ardour. Such a history as that of Logothetes could hardly have failed to impress the young Lycurgos even had he been as light-hearted and pleasure-loving as youths of his nation usually are ; but he exhibited a power of mind and a seriousness of disposition which enabled him to sympathise with his father's anxieties at an age when most boys care for little but amusement. Alexander Lycurgos was possessed by the passion of patriotism as truly as ever his father had been, but for him it centred entirely in the ancient Church of his native land, to which his best energies and deepest love were given.

He was an instance of that distinct vocation which in all ages has set men apart from infancy, like Samuel, to be in a special sense the servants of God ; and the position of the Greek Church in those days—depressed and fettered as she had been by the long period of Moslem rule—was such as to

render his devotion to her the most essential service he could offer to his country.

We need scarcely say that under the Turkish yoke, as in all the vicissitudes of preceding ages, the changeless Eastern Church had held inviolate the dogmas of her faith and the formulæ of her ritual ; but it had been inevitable in such circumstances that her priests should remain uneducated, and that the spiritual life of her unhappy people should sink far below its former level. Fully comprehending these evils, and earnestly desiring to combat them, at least in his own person, Alexander Lycurgos flung himself with all the ardour of his strong nature into the study of theology. He was but ten years old when his family settled in Athens ; but his father took care that he should at once have every advantage in education, and, so soon as he was of a suitable age, he entered the newly established University of Athens, where he remained as an indefatigable student till the year 1851. His career was one of remarkable distinction ; and, young as he was, his absolute devotion to his studies won him the friendship of many eminent persons. Attractions of no ordinary nature tempted him to a life of ease and pleasure—for Athens was at that time an especially gay little capital ; its inhabitants were almost intoxicated by the sense of freedom from foreign oppression, and were ready to seize every opportunity afforded them by the court, the *corps diplomatique*, or the theatres, for holding high festival on most days of the week ; and as a rule every young man in the place gave himself up heart and soul to enjoyment. To all this Alexander Lycurgos was a notable exception. Not only did he hold aloof from the amusements which were irresistible to his companions, but he sought almost exclusively the society of men older than himself. Some of these who have survived to this day still speak with enthusiasm of his brilliant University course, and the fair prospects which lay before him in whatever profession he might have chosen. In 1850 his father died, and the peaceful end sanctified by the rites of the Church, which for so many troubled years must have seemed to George Lycurgos Logothetes a boon far beyond his hopes, was granted to him in fullest measure. One year after this heavy loss Alexander Lycurgos received the reward of his industry in being appointed Government student, which gave him the privilege of studying at the national expense in the Universities of Germany and France. He selected those of Leipsic, Heidelberg, Halle, and Berlin ; and leaving Athens at once, he remained in Germany during seven years of unremitting study. Among the professors

there were many who formed a very high opinion of his talents, and took great interest in his subsequent career—especially Tischendorf, Tholuck, Bernhardt, and Müller. When at Berlin he attended the theological seminary; and on one occasion he made there a very remarkable speech on the attitude of the Greek Church towards science, which he maintained to be one of perfect sincerity and liberality, while she never swerved in the remotest degree from the primitive faith which had been held by her unchangeably. He took the degree of Doctor of Philology, and after travelling in France he returned to Greece as one of the most highly cultivated men of which the young kingdom could boast. Arrived at home he took no interval of rest, but allowed himself to be named at once *Privat-docent*, and gave a course of instruction in theology to a select number of pupils for a period of two years; and in 1861 he was named Professor of Theology in the University of Athens. His success was extraordinary; his classes were attended by crowds of enthusiastic students who were subjugated by his eloquence. If earthly fame had been his object, he must then have felt that he was in a fair way to realise it. But a far higher and purer hope had been cherished by Alexander Lycurgos. His one desire from childhood had been to serve God and his people in the office of the priesthood. But feeling keenly how much the Greek Church was still suffering from the want of education in the greater number of her clergy, he would not take her vows upon himself till he had reached the highest mental cultivation he could in any way attain. Modest and unassuming as he was, he could no longer doubt that the result of his self-training amply justified him in entering on this great office, and in 1862 he went on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem for that purpose.

The word 'pilgrimage' has a different signification in the Greek Church from that which it bears elsewhere. It never takes in the slightest degree a penitential character. Whatever system of penance exists in the Eastern Communion is of the simplest description, and practically the only manner in which it is ever enforced is by the penitent being debarred by his confessor from the Holy Eucharist for a space of time varying according to his fault. Pilgrimages in the East as well as in the West are sometimes undertaken in fulfilment of vows made in moments of peril or anxiety, but the pilgrimage of Alexander Lycurgos was performed in accordance with an Eastern opinion, that a special sanctification and blessing accompany holy orders received at Jerusalem. To whatever cause it may be attributed, Alexander Lycurgos

believed his spiritual life to have been singularly quickened by his visit to the Holy City, where he received ordination from the hands of the venerable Patriarch, Cyril. His letters to his friends in Athens expressed deep religious feeling, and an enthusiastic sense of the benefit he had derived from his consecration to God in the most hallowed spot on earth. Most of these letters were to an intimate friend and former fellow-student, to whom he wrote more unreservedly than to any other. Of these we subjoin two, written prior to ordination. The translation is as literal as may be, but the original has a quaintness of style, with a great purity of language, indicating the classical scholar and the habit of ecclesiastical phraseology, which it is not easy to render without exaggeration. He writes with the openness and familiarity natural between fellow-students, and the 'Kyrillos' spoken of was a priest who accompanied him on his journey:—

‘On the Holy Mount Thabor,

‘August 2 (O. S.), 1862.

‘Dear and well-loved Friend,—I have arrived at last in the Holy Land, and in the deepest emotion of my heart I am visiting the sacred spots where *the feet of the Lord have stood*, and where I ever salute reverently the precious traces of Him.

‘I saw all that was interesting at Alexandria, and was treated by our countrymen established there with great honour and much hospitality. Indeed, they wished to persuade me to remain till the next steamer, that I might go to Cairo and speak with his Holiness the Patriarch of Alexandria about an affair which was troubling them; but Kyrillos did not wish it, so I had to give it up, and departed, promising to write to the Patriarch about it, and to beg the Patriarch of Jerusalem to write to him also; and I advised them at the same time, as the question involves a point of ecclesiastical law, to write to the Professor of Canon Law in Greece, and ask his opinion. That is to say, whether the Patriarch has a right to insist on administering the funds of a church built within the jurisdiction of his throne by persons professing the same religion but belonging to a different nationality?

‘During all this voyage from Alexandria to Kraïpha I was full of enthusiasm and joy at the thought that it was soon to be granted to me to see those localities where the holiest mysteries of our Faith took place, and of which from a child I had so often heard and read.

‘Arriving towards evening on the 27th at the little town of Kraïpha, we remained there in the establishment belonging to the monastery of the Holy Sepulchre; and the next day we ascended Mount Carmel, at the foot of which lies this little town. It was here that the Prophet Elias lived. The view from it is magnificent, and it is quite covered with trees, chiefly olive-trees, towards its base. On the ridge of the mountain, towards the sea, there is a Latin monastery dedicated to the Prophet Elias. We visited the monastery, and a little way

farther down towards the sea we were shown a grotto, which, according to tradition, was the place where Elias and other prophets taught their disciples; and for this reason it still bears the name of the *School of the Prophets*. There we met by chance many Jews and Jewesses, who had come out of devotion on a pilgrimage from all parts of the country, dancing and shouting in the most enthusiastic manner: one must have seen them to understand what religious enthusiasm is among the peoples of the East.

'Towards evening we returned to Kraipha, and started again from thence about midnight, *riding on asses*, towards Nazareth. Kyrillos kept saying the whole way it was a pity you were not there to see us. We travelled in this way the whole night, under a lovely moon, and through a dreary desert. In the morning, one hour before daylight, we arrived at Nazareth, the home of our Lord. There having heard that the Patriarch was on Mount Thabor, we announced our arrival to him; and he at once sent a man with horses and a letter, asking us to go up to him on the mountain. Thus, after having rested the whole of Sunday from the fatigues of our journey, and having seen the holy places of Nazareth—that is to say, the spot where, according to tradition, the Annunciation to the Holy Virgin took place, and the workshop of her betrothed Joseph, and others—we started a little before the rising of the sun, and after two hours found ourselves on the mount of the Divine Transformation, where we found the Patriarch, and having kissed his hand, were received by him with the most kind hospitality.

'Mount Thabor is one of the most beautiful mountains I ever saw in my life. It stands quite alone in the middle of Galilee, and is higher than all the other hills around. Its shape is like a globe cut across at the top. On the summit is a small plain, most fertile. The sides are thickly wooded, chiefly with oak trees, which are full of birds, and shelter wild beasts. The view is perfectly splendid: to the south one sees the plain of Jezreel, as it is called in Holy Scripture; to the west, several wooded heights, behind which lies Nazareth; to the north and east, first the flat ground where the crowd of people sat to hear our Saviour's discourse on the Beatitudes; farther on, part of the lake of Gennesaret, and beyond the Antilibanon. During the morning hours the mountain is covered with very thick clouds. In general the air is so pure, and the whole scene so enchanting, that one can justly say, in the words of S. Peter, when he saw the Transfiguration of the Saviour on that spot, 'It is well for us to be here: let us build three tabernacles.' It is curious that we are in fact living in tabernacles (tents), as, except the Church of the Transfiguration, which his Holiness has built on the ruins of an ancient temple, there exists no other edifice here to dwell in.

'We shall remain here till the 6th of the month (the festival of the Transfiguration), when the consecration of the church will take place, and then descend to Nazareth; from thence passing through the country of Tiberias to Samaria, and, finally, to the Holy City of Jerusalem. With the Patriarch there is also here the Bishop of Nazareth, a Cretan by birth, quite a man of the new generation, and who was

educated twenty years ago in the Gymnasium of Syros. With him I have visited many interesting spots on the mountain. Yesterday evening he took me to see the eagles' nests : it was splendid to see the eagles soaring on high.

'Meantime, in order to make you a participator in the sacredness of these spots, I enclose some leaves from the trees of Thabor and of Carmel.

'I salute you from my heart. Salute all my friends from me by name, and write soon.—Yours as a brother,

'ALEXANDROS LYCURGOS.'

The following letter was written from Jerusalem to the same friend—the only person to whom the Archbishop would have spoken so freely of his feelings at any time, we believe, of his career:—

'In Jerusalem, August 16, 1862.

'Dear and much loved Friend,—I wrote to you two weeks ago from the Holy Mount Thabor, announcing to you my safe arrival in the Holy Land. I now write to you from the Holy City of Jerusalem, where by God's grace I arrived in good health on the evening of Saturday last. If my visit to Nazareth, to the Holy Mount Thabor, to Jacob's Well, and other sacred spots, which I saw before I came here, affected me very strongly, much more deep has been my emotion on visiting this Holy City. Indeed, my agitation was so great when, on the morning of Sunday last, I entered for the first time the Church of the Resurrection, in order to worship at Golgotha, at the Holy Sepulchre, and other sacred witnesses of the Passion of our Saviour, that these were the strongest emotions religious feeling had ever aroused in my heart. When I stood on Golgotha, and thought that on this very spot the Cross of our Lord had been planted, and his Precious Blood had flowed, I was so much overcome that I could not refrain from tears; and I then understood how right are those who believe that the sight of the sacred spots where the deepest mysteries of our Salvation have been enacted has no small influence in arousing religious fervour.

'In my last letter I wrote to you, if I do not mistake, that I had intended to follow the Patriarch in his tour through the villages of Galilee and Samaria; but when I found that his journey would last till September, and that I should not have sufficient time for the work before me, I decided, insisting thereupon with Kyrillos, to hasten my arrival here. The Patriarch agreed all the more readily to this because he wished me to assist here in the organisation of the lessons of the Theological School, and to make as many alterations as I might think necessary in the regulations.

'On arriving here I received from every one, great and small, many honours and attentions. I was given, by order of the Patriarch, the best rooms in his palace, and in general the treatment I have received from the Patriarch, and the honour he has done me, have been far above my expectations. When on Mount Thabor I wished one day

to make an excursion to the Lake of Gennesaret, he gave me his own horse, his secretary, three other ecclesiastics, two guards, and two servants. When I left Mount Thabor to travel through Samaria on my way here, he desired the Bishop of Nazareth to accompany me to Cana, where the marriage took place at which our Lord changed the water into wine, and thence to Nazareth. He was desired then to ask from the authorities an escort of soldiers to accompany me to Jerusalem. I spoke with his Holiness about my ordination. He rejoiced greatly that I remained faithful to my first decision; and it was settled that after his return, a few days before the Festival of the Cross (September 14), he would ordain me deacon, and on the Festival of the Cross, which is celebrated in the Church of the Resurrection with much pomp, he would consecrate me a priest. To my surprise, without saying anything to me about it, he wrote to his attendant here to order my ecclesiastical robes. They are now being prepared; so you see that everything is absolutely decided, and what I have desired from my heart since my childhood is soon to be accomplished. Since I have once put my hand to the plough of this divine work, I ought also to take this step—though it is a step very great and full of danger—because I have thus to pass over the boundaries which separate the life according to the world (which I have hitherto lived) from the life of an ecclesiastic. This decision about my ordination need not be kept secret, but, on the contrary, you can announce it publicly; and on the day of the ceremony I beg of you to invite all our friends in my name to spend the evening happily together, and give me their good wishes.

‘I forgot to write to you that on Mount Thabor on August 6, when the consecration of the Church of the Transfiguration took place, I had, by order of the Patriarch, to make a discourse. It is true that now I rejoice within myself, and glorify the guidance of the Divine Providence, that it was granted me to preach at the consecration of a temple built on the very spot where our Lord was transfigured, but at the time when the Patriarch proposed it to me, believe me that I felt much embarrassed. First, the proposal was made to me suddenly the evening before, so that the time was very short; and secondly, I had no other book of reference near me but the Holy Gospel. However, what could I do? To refuse was impossible; so I submitted, and shutting myself into my tent I composed what I could in haste. I preached it the next day after the reading of the Gospel, and the Greeks who were present seemed much pleased. The Patriarch gave me his blessing and his good wishes. The discourse will be published soon by a printing-office here.

‘I finish my letter by embracing you with all my heart and saluting all our friends.—Yours as a brother,

‘ALEXANDROS LYCURGOS.’

The friendship which then commenced between the future Archbishop and the Patriarch Cyril of Jerusalem was a source of great happiness to him during the remainder of his life, although they never again met, and kept up their intercourse

only by letter. Returning to Athens, Alexander Lycurgos was at once appointed public preacher, an office which the Eastern Church only bestows on priests especially qualified for it. The *ἐφημέριος* (parish priest) is very rarely allowed to preach, and, in like manner, only elected individuals are permitted to receive confessions, and these receive a licence which confers the title of *πνευματικὸς πατήρ* (spiritual father). Alexander Lycurgos soon attracted great attention by his eloquence and learning, and both his countrymen and foreign residents thronged to hear him. The admiration which he excited, expressed with all the fervid enthusiasm of that southern people, might naturally have excited vanity and self-esteem, but the singular modesty and humility with which he met the applause so lavishly bestowed is still a subject of remark among those who knew him at that period. During this time he continued his lectures as Professor of Theology, which he felt to be of great importance to the young men who were to replace the older generation of priests, with their inevitable deficiencies of education and training. Four years only after his return from Jerusalem one of the highest positions in the Greek Church became vacant, and the choice of the Holy Synod fell at once on Alexander Lycurgos. In 1866 he was appointed Archbishop of the Cyclades. It is unhappily notorious that in the East any important vacancy develops rivalries and intrigues, which often result in very unscrupulous means being used to dispossess the person appointed. Alexander Lycurgos was no exception to this rule. False rumours were industriously circulated as to the nature of his political sympathies, which for a time prevented his election from being confirmed. To explain these charges we must go back to the period when Greece first became a free kingdom. At that time the Bavarian Regency, with the consent of the nation, declared the Hellenic Church independent of the Patriarchate of Constantinople; but after a few years a difficulty arose in maintaining this independence from a somewhat singular circumstance. The Holy Chrism used in Confirmation and other rites could only be consecrated by the Patriarch of Constantinople, through whom it was supplied to all the churches under his jurisdiction. The store of this sacred unguent extant in Greece at the date of her independence had of course been obtained in this manner, and when at last its exhaustion necessitated a renewal of the supply, it became also necessary for Greece to recognise the mother Church as her ecclesiastical head, and for her administrative independence to be sanctioned by special treaty with the

Patriarchate. With regard to the mode of carrying out this arrangement two opposing parties arose. One was headed by a very able man named Economos, formerly an ecclesiastical dignitary in Russia, and greatly under the influence of the Russian Government. His party desired to limit as much as possible the independence of the Greek Church and render her completely subservient to the Patriarchate, and it was called the Russian or Nappiste party. The other, led by Pharmakides, Alexander's predecessor as University Professor of Theology, and supported by many distinguished persons, was regarded as the Liberal party, and as more or less under English influence. The convention proposed between Greece and the Patriarch was called the *Tomos*, and Pharmakides published a learned but somewhat virulent work against it, entitled the *Antitomos*. Finally a compromise was effected, and the Patriarchate fully recognised the independence of the Greek Church; but many minor points remained subject to discussion, and exercised the party spirit that was still kept alive by political influences. The original question had been settled long before Alexander Lycurgos had even returned from Germany, but when raised to the Episcopate, the Russian faction took advantage of his well-known liberality of mind to accuse him of an unconstitutional bias. The charges were so manifestly untrue that his enemies could only cause a brief delay in the confirmation of his election, and, so soon as the full ceremonies necessary for his consecration could be arranged, it took place in Athens on July the 12th, 1866. The Archbishop immediately quitted the capital which had so long been his home, and settled at Syros as the centre of his diocese. The position to which Lycurgos was raised was one of great spiritual authority and dignity, but of most apostolic—it might almost be called Spartan—simplicity as to temporal advantages. The kingdom of Greece has thirty-one dioceses, and each bishop residing in the capital town of a province (*nomarchia*) has the title of Archbishop. Until about twenty years ago, all the bishops depended for their incomes on gratuitous contributions alone, as the lower clergy do to this day. But since then the Greek Government has provided them with salaries of certainly a most modest description. The annual income of the Metropolitan of Athens is 6,000 drachmas, or 215*l*. Each Archbishop has 5,000 drachmas, or 180*l*., and each bishop 4,000 drachmas, or 143*l*.; and they receive about as much again from donations on being invited personally to perform any church office on behalf of private individuals. These voluntary offerings vary from fifteen to thirty shillings on each occasion,

while those given to parish priests, who of course are obliged to officiate when required, never exceed five and more often amount only to one or two shillings. The system, which has continued in the Eastern Church from Apostolic times, of thus leaving the clergy entirely dependent on voluntary gratuities, is now the chief cause of the parish priests being of an inferior social grade, and still for the most part uneducated. The parish priests in the villages are simply the sons of peasants, who have received sufficient instruction to read well and understand the Greek of the Gospels. Even in the towns they only belong to the middle classes, and have rarely gone through a course of theology. Moreover, they are debarred from rising to any higher dignity, as they must be married men; and thus they usually live and die amid the simple duties of the parish to which they are first appointed. For this reason students of theology, who have accomplished the University course, never become parish priests, but fill higher ecclesiastical offices, such as that of Secretary to the Holy Synod or to the Bishops; they seek to be made professors or appointed preachers, in order that they may become superiors of monasteries, and have a chance of rising to the Episcopate. Alexander Lycurgos himself, after his ordination at Jerusalem, remained Professor of Theology, and undertook no regular priestly duty beyond that of preaching till he became Archbishop. This high position, however, was not one of luxury or splendour, but rather a heavy yoke binding him to severe and self-denying labour.

Syros and Tenos were the two most important islands under the care of the Archbishop of the Cyclades, and there were peculiar circumstances connected with each which made the charge one of exceptional difficulty; but it had the effect of manifesting the loving wisdom and purity of his administration. Syros, standing as it does in the highway of the East, is continually visited by ships; and this has produced a degree of culture and intelligence in the inhabitants, which would in any case have rendered them less easy to govern than the simple people in the more retired parts of Greece. But there were other reasons which rendered the maintenance of peace in the island so difficult, that it had become a problem which no previous bishop had been able to solve. The principal town is divided into two portions, Higher and Lower Syros, and the whole of Upper Syros is exclusively inhabited by Roman Catholics. They are the direct descendants of those Latin Christians who settled in the island when it was subject to the Re-

public of Venice, and though now essentially Greek, in nationality, language, and customs, they are not only rigidly tenacious of their own faith, but bitterly hostile to the Eastern Church. They are governed by a Roman Catholic Bishop, who has his residence in Syros, but whose jurisdiction extends over the whole of the Cyclades; most of these islands, notably Tenos and Santorin, having a portion of their population, in like manner, of Italian descent and religion from the old Venetian days. Previous to Lycurgos' appointment, a most bitter animosity had existed between the Greeks and the Roman Catholics, which in Syros especially was envenomed by personal antipathy between the Orthodox and Latin Bishops, and their respective clergy. The manner in which Archbishop Lycurgos dealt with this painful state of matters is one of the most striking parts of his history. From the very commencement of his episcopate he set himself to extinguish an antagonism which he felt to be unworthy of those who, in any case, were followers of the same Master. He succeeded beyond his hopes. His gentle conciliatory spirit towards the Roman Catholics, and the quiet wisdom with which he managed his own people in their relations with them, not only completely overcame the hostility between them, but also won for himself a personal friendship from the Roman Catholic Bishop, which remained unbroken throughout his whole subsequent career. It will easily be understood, however, that his position in Syros could not but continue to the end one of great delicacy and trial.

The difficulties which awaited the Archbishop at Tenos were of a very different description. This island is believed to possess a special sanctity by Eastern Christians, not only in Greece and the Ionian Islands, but throughout Turkey; and countless numbers make a pilgrimage to it on one particular day in the year. The origin of its celebrity as a holy place dates from the discovery, half a century since, of an ancient icon of the Panagia in a grotto, said to have been indicated to a certain bishop by a dream. This sacred picture being brought to light was speedily reported by some who professed to speak from experience to be θαυματουργή (wonder-working). Eastern Christians, at least the lower orders, believe that miracles have not ceased within the Church; but, in cases where these are supposed to be effected by any material agency, such as an icon or a stream of water, or a special locality, they do not in the slightest degree attribute any power to the *media*, but simply believe that the Divine Being chooses the prayers, which might be offered

efficaciously anywhere, to be associated with these means. The chief benefits which were supposed to be derived from supplications made in connection with the icon of Tenos consisted in the recovery of the sick and maimed, and most especially of the *δαίμονιασμένοι*—in other words, the insane; for madness in every shape is believed by the lower orders in the East to be caused by the possession of devils, as completely now as in the days when our Lord cast them out in Judæa—so much so that, in the familiar language of the present day, if a person acts in any eccentric manner, a Greek says, ‘Are you demonised?’ instead of ‘Are you mad?’ The report that cures of this description were effected through the agency of the Panagia of Tenos soon spread far and wide, and in course of time a large church was erected over the grotto where the icon was placed, and to which all persons afflicted with mental disease were taken. This church is now possessed of a very considerable endowment, in consequence of the numerous and rich gifts which have been made to it by persons who believed that they had received blessings within its walls. It is even said that a wealthy Turk, who was still a Mohammedan in belief, had come there to test the wonder-working powers of the icon, and having been cured of his malady, testified his gratitude by the gift of a large sum of money. This fund is managed by a committee, which is now enabled by it to maintain various other religious institutions in connexion with the church, such as schools, a free lodging-house for the poorer pilgrims, and a large convent of nuns. This is by far the most important religious house in Greece at the present time, and contains a numerous society of dedicated women of the order of S. Basil, to which rule also belong the numerous brotherhoods of men. These establishments in Tenos are all under the jurisdiction of the Archbishop, and that which chiefly embarrasses the ecclesiastical government of the island is the great annual pilgrimage which takes place on August 15. The festival of that day is termed in the Eastern Church ‘the sleep (*κοίμησις*) of the Panagia,’ the doctrine of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin not being declared an article of faith as it is by the Church of Rome. The point is one on which the Greek Church refrains from dogmatising, in accordance with her principle of avoiding absolute definition upon mystical subjects not essential to salvation, while at the same time she does not interfere with the belief of her people in traditions which she considers worthy of respect from their antiquity. As regards the commemoration of August 15, the Eastern Church

simply declares that on that day the mother of our Lord 'fell asleep:' no such word as *ἀνάληψις*, or any other which would imply that she was carried up to heaven, is ever used concerning her, and all the icons which represent the *κοίμησις τῆς Παναγίας* picture her lying on a bier carried by a procession of priests. The notion, however, which prevails among the common people, and which probably is derived from some ancient tradition, appears to assume that the sacred body of the Holy Virgin was not buried like an ordinary person, but in some mysterious manner was conveyed away, although there is no definite belief as to where it was taken. An immense concourse of pilgrims, then, comes to Tenos on this day, and it is by no means limited to those who are nationally Greeks. From Syria, Turkey, and many parts of Europe the sick and insane are brought to the church over the grotto. The *δαίμονιασμένοι* are generally bound to the pillars before the altar until after the celebration of the Holy Eucharist, when it is hoped that they are to be found restored to their right mind—and the whole spectacle is one of the most remarkable to be seen at any time in Greece. The service on the actual festival consists simply of the usual Liturgy, at which the Archbishop assists; but the pilgrims remain on the island for days, and it may well be imagined that the assembling together of a great crowd, who are not only strangers to each other, but diverse in nationality and customs, is certain to engender dissensions of a somewhat bitter description. Previous to the appointment of Lycurgos as Archbishop, the quarrels and disturbances which took place on these occasions were very serious; but from the hour that he first took his place among the pilgrims as their spiritual head, the dignity and gentleness with which he entered into all subjects of complaint and presided over the whole proceedings caused the jealousies that had hitherto been so rife to give place, as if by magic, to the Christian love and courtesy of which he was himself so bright an example. Travellers who visited the island at the time of the pilgrimage noted the total absence of fanaticism in the Archbishop's mode of dealing with the solemnities, while his liberal-mindedness did not in the least detract from the unaffected piety with which he carried out the teaching of his Church. These happy results were not limited to his own diocese. He became so well known and respected in the distant provinces from whence the pilgrims came, that his influence for good extended into regions he was never destined personally to visit; and we believe that many a deputation travelled far to lay before

him difficult questions, or to gain his intervention in disputes which they believed could best be healed by his wise counsels.

Apart from all exceptional occasions, the ordinary duties which Archbishop Lycurgos had to perform from day to day were, precisely from his unusual power and ability, of a very onerous description. To form some idea of his daily life, we must remember that, so far as the ceremonies of the Eastern Church are concerned, the offices which can only be performed by the chief Pastor are not the same as in our communion. A Greek bishop is bound to take his part in the Liturgy generally as celebrant on every Sunday and holyday, and to assist at all special services where his presence is required. These are both numerous and peculiar. Besides baptisms, burials, and offices of thanksgiving, it is the rule to seek his attendance at all ceremonies for the commemoration of the dead. A very beautiful service takes place on the anniversary of death, and is rarely omitted by the survivors during many years, when they are in circumstances to afford the offering of corn and wine which is always made on these occasions. But it is also the custom of Eastern Christians to associate their dead with every event of interest in the family, and at these times an office is said at the grave, at which they always seek the bishop's presence. When death has taken place at a distance from the family home, it is against the law to remove the body until it has been for two years interred where life ended ; but it is the almost invariable custom to exhume the body at the close of the two years, when it is brought home and the coffin opened in the presence of a bishop or priest, who says certain prayers, and then assists in having the remains carried, in a small chest prepared for the purpose, to the church. Here they are placed at the back of the altar, and remain there during three celebrations of the Holy Eucharist, after which they are deposited in a building specially consecrated for the reception of such relics. The common people in Greece have a curious superstition which renders this service one of the deepest importance to them. They believe that if the body is found undecayed it proves the deceased to have been exceptionally sinful, or that he has been cursed by some one whom he had wronged. A more pleasing duty often imposed on the bishop is to assist some devout family in an office which is called 'the opening of a church.' This has a very different meaning from that which the phrase would have in this country. To them it signifies a celebration of the Holy Sacrament, at their expense, in some one of the countless little deserted churches which in Greece

are scattered over the whole country, and are to be found in the most lonely and inaccessible places. The existence of these half-ruined chapels is due to the fact that in early days it was the custom to build a Christian church, however small, wherever a heathen temple had stood, in order to counteract the original dedication to a false god. The analogy of the ancient name is always carefully maintained in the Christian dedication. Thus temples to Minerva, including the Parthenon itself, are given to the Panagia; those to the sun-god (always perched on the top of some high rock) are offered to the Prophet Elias (Helios); a temple to Hercules, as the personification of physical strength, is offered to the Archangels Michael and Gabriel, called in Greek the incorporeal powers. Neptune becomes S. Nicholas, patron of sailors; Theseus, with his battles, is succeeded by S. George and his dragon; and an edifice anciently used near Athens for the preparation of heathen ceremonies—*Παρασκευὴ τῶν πομπῶν*—is replaced by a church dedicated to Saint Paraskevi. No general use is or could be made of those solitary sanctuaries; but the Greeks believe that pious persons can give special glory to God and perform an acceptable act of worship by causing the Holy Sacrifice to be celebrated on a long abandoned altar, and filling with the voice of praise and prayer the walls of an ever-silent church: therefore, on any day commemorative of either joy or sorrow in their family, they invite the bishop, if possible—if not, a priest—to accompany them to some little chapel they have chosen. They carry with them the requisites for a Celebration, the elements for consecration, the wax tapers for the altar, with the incense; and journeying through the night, they arrive at early morning for the service to take place at sunrise. It would be difficult to describe the charm of the scene which follows under the radiant light of an Eastern dawn: the time-worn little chapel shaded by its grey old olive-trees, the purple mountains in the distance, the chant of the priests rising through the pure still air, and the fragrance of the incense mingling with the sweeter scent of the wild thyme; while the little group of worshippers, cut off from all the world, seem to be drawn nearer to their God, and pray with deeper fervour. Archbishop Lycurgos was ever ready, when called upon, to join in scenes like these, although his duties of obligation might well have been pleaded in excuse.

Among the Greeks, the Sacrament of Confirmation follows immediately on Baptism, and consists in anointing the newly baptized infant with the Holy Chrism 'as the seal of the Holy Ghost.' It can be performed by any priest. Neither is a

bishop usually licensed as a confessor. Priests are appointed in each parish to this office, of whom the ἐφημέριος or incumbent is usually one. The duties of a Greek confessor are not laborious; the office is entirely distinct from that of a director, confession being made only before receiving the blessed Sacrament, and frequent communion is not the custom in the Eastern Church. Thus the Archbishop's exemption from this function did not save him from the heavier labours arising from the numbers who sought him for direction and counsel. Such was his reputation for sanctity and wisdom that all who were in trouble or difficulty, and could by any means reach him, invariably did so; and he afforded them every facility, attending at certain hours in a room of which the doors were set wide open, with free access from the street, so that whosoever would, might find him ready to receive rich and poor alike, with no other formality than that each must wait his turn without distinction of rank. None ever left his presence without consolation, to which in the case of his poorer visitors were often added liberal gifts for their necessities. Personally most frugal and self-denying, he loved to show hospitality to those who were in need; but the austere simplicity of his household might have served as a model for a religious house, although he himself never belonged to any monastic community. In this latter particular he was an exception to the usual custom in the case of Eastern bishops, who are generally monks vowed to celibacy, because, according to Canon Law, they must be either unmarried or widowers. Alexander Lycurgos, however, was always a celibate, and it is believed that even before his ordination he never contemplated marriage. The examination of candidates for orders fell heavily upon him. The rule is that all candidates for any sacred office must be examined by the Holy Synod on the recommendation of some bishop, and the Archbishop had therefore not only to take his share in the work of the Synod when it was his turn to be a member of it, but he had also to investigate the claims of those aspirants—and they were many—who sought his special recommendation. An Eastern bishop has to judge, with the aid of four officials named by Government, all faults committed by his clergy, and punish them accordingly; and the 8th Article of the Greek Canon Law requires him to give the most minute supervision throughout his diocese to every particular of the conduct of Divine worship. The most anxious labours of the Archbishop were, however, the duties which called him away from home.

The Holy Synod consists of five Bishops, of whom the

Metropolitan of Athens is President ; but the others change every year, each of the Bishops attending in turn. Lycurgos was therefore obliged to go to Athens in the regular routine, and also whenever his help or advice was required on any special occasion. It was his custom to visit all the islands which constituted his diocese in rotation, besides visiting them from time to time as need arose. His office in beautiful Delos was a sinecure, as it is now uninhabited ; but in the others his supervision was often required. This was especially the case in the islands where there were monasteries.

There is an impression in England that religious houses in Greece have been suppressed in the same manner as in Italy under Victor Emmanuel, and that while the old monks and nuns are left undisturbed, it is intended that they should die out without successors. This is a mistake ; reform only, and not abolition, having been the object of the Government. The first edict in the beginning of the reign of King Otho closed all monasteries with fewer than six monks, transferring their members to the larger monasteries, whose size was sufficient to justify their maintenance. There was no difficulty in this so far as their 'Rule' was concerned, all the monks being of the same order (S. Basil), and the measure was one of absolute necessity. Brigandage was then rife ; and when two or three monks, generally aged men, formed the sole inmates of a convent perched high among the hills in some picturesque solitude, they were easily compelled to receive any robber band which demanded food and shelter. Another cogent reason lay in the state of the extensive lands belonging to these small communities, and to which it was quite impossible that a few old monks could do justice. Undoubtedly it was an anomalous state of matters that the peasants, who are usually small proprietors in Greece, should often be ruined by the high rate of interest they had to pay for sums necessary to the cultivation of their lands, and obliged to mortgage their expected crops in order to buy seed for the spring, while vast tracts of monastic lands were lying waste, or their produce absorbed by two or three men who were exempt alike from taxation and from conscription. The change therefore was wise and just, and the money saved by the closing of the small convents has been used solely to establish schools in different parts of the country. But the measure was in no way intended to prevent the increase of existing communities, and all who desire to enter the religious life are still received precisely as before. We have entered into these details, as the Archbishop was much occupied with the questions involved in them. Several

monasteries, and the large nunnery at Tenos already mentioned, were under his jurisdiction, and the care of the religious houses was by no means an easy part of his duty. The life led by these Eastern communities, whether of men or women, is extremely severe; but, though virtually cloistered, they have ample opportunity of ministering to others, for they receive under their roof the sick and destitute, and they have the still more onerous duty of tending insane or idiotic persons. There are no lunatic asylums in Greece, and the mentally afflicted are the charge of the religious communities. The constant supervision of these houses was therefore in many ways no sinecure. Besides the monasteries and other charitable establishments, the Archbishop was more or less responsible for the right conduct of all the schools in his diocese. Every public educational establishment in Greece, from the village school, taught generally by the parish priest, to the University of Athens itself, is entirely free. The son of the poorest peasant may go on from the infant school, where he learns his alphabet, to the college, whence he receives his licence to act as physician or lawyer, without his education having cost him anything whatever. Young Greeks of the present day are ambitious, and many boys who pass through the usual routine in their own villages, go to Athens to complete their studies, where, in order to maintain themselves during their three years' course, they act as assistants in shops or as servants in private families, and, instead of wages, they receive permission to attend college lectures, while at other hours they serve their employers in return for board and lodging. These student servants form a class apart and are greatly esteemed, and the Archbishop interested himself actively on behalf of such as went from his own diocese.

The Archbishop's reputation as an eloquent preacher brought him a heavy addition to his ordinary duties, in the constant demands of the Government for funeral orations over distinguished personages. Several of these were masterpieces both in matter and style, and are, we believe, still procurable in Athens. Amongst the number we may specially mention the splendid oration which he pronounced in the cathedral at Athens over the coffin containing the body of the Patriarch who had been martyred at Constantinople fifty years before. It was a remarkable occasion, and one which drew forth all that was most enthusiastic in the Archbishop's religious and patriotic feelings. Gregory, Patriarch of Constantinople, suffered on Easter Day, 1824, when the Turks hanged him at the gate of his own palace, in revenge for the rebellion of his

countrymen, then commencing the war of independence. He had elected voluntarily to die as the representative of his people, instead of saving himself, as he might have done had he chosen to abandon them to the fury that would have fallen on less illustrious victims in his absence. When at the foot of the scaffold, he was again offered not only life but highest honours and wealth, if he would apostatise from the faith and become a Moslem ; but he turned with calm dignity to his executioners, and bid them not insult with any such offer a servant of the Crucified. A true martyr was he indeed ; and since that Easter Day when he yielded up his soul after protracted torture, all Oriental Christians believe that a miracle was accomplished in order to secure to him the rites of Christian sepulture, which it was the special object of his murderers to prevent. We have not space to give the singular details, and can only briefly state that after the body of Gregory, heavily weighted with stones, was cast into the Bosphorus, it was seen to approach, by some strange means, a Russian vessel sailing towards the Black Sea. It was taken on board by the awestruck crew and conveyed to Odessa, where it was laid to rest with all the funeral ceremonies of the Church. The Russians considered it a sacred possession ; but the Patriarch's countrymen always desired that he should repose on the soil of Greece, and at last, on the fiftieth anniversary of his death, they obtained permission from the Russian Government to remove the body to Athens. This was the story which the Archbishop had to recall to the enthusiastic Greeks who stood round that time-honoured coffin, where the head with its long white hair and beard was visible through a glass that had been inserted in the lid. Lycurgos knew, as he looked down on him whom he regarded as a martyr and a saint, that this was also the Patriarch who had befriended his own beloved father, and whose name had rung in his ears throughout his childhood, as that of the holy man whose example it were blessed indeed to follow. Well might he seem almost inspired by such a theme, and the recollection of his fervid eloquence on that great occasion will long live in the memory of all who heard him.

At Syros the Archbishop's remarkable preaching is best remembered in connexion with his Lenten Sermons. He always undertook these special lectures himself ; and it is much to be wished that some record of them could still be procured and published—they were so purely spiritual, so simply Christian in their teaching, that they would be as useful for the instruction of members of our communion as for those

of his own Church. In such labours as these, joined to much unobtrusive toil among the poor and sick, Archbishop Lycurgos passed the first four years after his consecration. Then came a change which seems destined to have far-reaching results. In 1870 it became necessary that a bishop should be invited to come from Greece to Liverpool, in order to consecrate a large church newly built for the numerous Greeks resident there. It was the unanimous decision of the authorities in Athens, and of all concerned, that the Archbishop of the Cyclades should represent the Greek hierarchy on that occasion. It has been thought that Alexander Lycurgos came to our shores for the simple purpose of opening the Church of S. Nicholas, without any ulterior view, and that he was taken by surprise at the reception he met with from so many of our most notable clergy and laity. This is in many respects a mistake. It is true that, modest and unassuming as he was, he felt some surprise at being personally an object of so much attention, but we believe that his own purpose in coming to England, and that of the Holy Synod who sanctioned his journey, was by no means limited to the simple consecration of the Liverpool Church. The Archbishop was too well versed in the progress of modern ideas to be unaware of the reunion movement in England and elsewhere, and this made him anxious to acquaint himself with the English Church, so as to judge how far she retained what he considered the essentials of orthodoxy. Moreover, the interchange of courtesies which had taken place between English and Eastern bishops had aroused a general feeling in Greece, that the visit of one of their dignitaries to England might have results important enough to make it desirable to send the most distinguished member of their Synod. Speaking many years before on the subject of reunion to a person connected with Greece and England, and who was deeply interested in the question, the Archbishop expressed his earnest longing for the day when intercommunion might become possible, although the prospect of it was at that time much more hopeless than now. He then declared that he, for his part, would willingly concede all points except such as were held in the unchanging faith of his Church to be absolutely essential. What these were he stated in almost the same words as those in which he spoke long afterwards to the present Bishop of Winchester, who quoted them in the discussion on intercommunion in Convocation (February 16, 1876).

Meantime, to ascertain in what particulars the Church of England (apart from the crucial question of the *Filioque*)

differed essentially from the Eastern Church, the Archbishop came to England in the commencement of the year 1870; and had not been many days in Liverpool before he attended evening service at the Church of S. Margaret, and showed his catholicity of spirit by giving the blessing, at the request of the incumbent, to the kneeling congregation.

The Archbishop was treated with great distinction at Liverpool, where addresses were presented to him by the clergy and others—a compliment of which he had many repetitions later, after he had started on a round of visits to places of interest. We much regret that we have only space for the merest outline of his tour through England, as we believe that our readers would prefer to see our remaining pages filled with the circumstances of his subsequent life in his own diocese. The Archbishop of Canterbury greeted Lycurgos by letter immediately on his arrival, and at his request Mr. George Williams, so well known in connexion with the East, remained with the Greek prelate during his stay in this country. Mr. Gladstone was one of the first to receive the Archbishop as his guest, and a most enjoyable visit at Hawarden Castle saw the commencement of a friendship with the late Premier which was destined to prove the solace of his last hours of life. After leaving Hawarden he visited the Archbishop of York at Bishopthorpe; and at the close of January he spent three days with the Bishop of Lincoln, whom he characterised as the ‘Philhellenic Bishop.’ On this occasion, when the Greek prelate attended a service in the private chapel, Bishop Wordsworth recited the Nicene Creed in Greek with the omission of the clause *Filioque*, as was afterwards done also, we believe, by Dean Stanley at Westminster. We subjoin the Bishop of Lincoln’s explanation of this matter, which has been somewhat misunderstood.¹ From Lincoln he went to Nottingham, where he was present at the consecration of the Suffragan Bishop, and for the first time, we believe, witnessed the celebration of the Holy Eucharist in the Church of England. At the dinner which

¹ In a note appended to a very able sermon by the Bishop of Lincoln, on the Procession of the Holy Spirit, he says, ‘Let me be allowed here to offer a reply to some who have charged me with *omitting* the *Filioque* in the Nicene Creed, on the occasion of the visit of the Archbishop of Syros to Riseholme, and of his presence at our family prayers in the chapel there. I *omitted nothing* in the Creed. I recited the Creed in the *Greek* language in order that the Greek ecclesiastics present might join in it; and I did not, and could not, *interpolate* the Creed with the words *καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ*, which never were in the Greek Creed, and could not, therefore, be *added* by me to it, or *omitted* from it.’

followed the Bishop of Lincoln made a speech in Greek, of which the Archbishop often spoke with admiration, as he did also of the address of Dean Stanley at the Westminster dinner. After this the Archbishop visited the Bishops of Winchester and Ely, the Marquis of Salisbury, the Earl of Glasgow, Mr. Beresford Hope, and others. At Cambridge he received the degree of D.C.L.; at Oxford he was the guest of the President of Magdalen College. Immediately on his arrival in that city a deputation from the University waited upon him to present him with his doctor's robes; and there in the midst of a great assemblage he received the degree of D.D.—a distinction which had not been conferred on any person in a similar position for a period of a hundred and seventy years, when the same honour had been paid to another Eastern bishop, the Metropolitan of Philippopolis. On the Sunday which Archbishop Lycurgos passed in Oxford he was present at the celebration of Holy Communion in Magdalen College chapel, of which the President offered him the use for a celebration by himself according to the rites of his own Church. He was unable to accept this brotherly offer—indeed many requisites for the performance of the Liturgy according to the Oriental use could not have been procured in Oxford—but he fully appreciated the significance of the proposal, and the feelings which prompted it. The Archbishop had a long conversation with Dr. Pusey on the subject of the *Filioque*, as with many others, and left Oxford after a visit of three days for Windsor. There he had an audience of the Queen, who conversed with him in German, and seemed interested in his impressions of England. Afterwards he visited the Bishop of London, as the Archbishop of Canterbury was too unwell to receive him; and he was present at the consecration of the Bishop of Oxford and other prelates. It was noted that the Archbishop willingly joined in the family worship of the households where he was received as a guest. These pleasant visits to the 'Christ-loving English,' as he named them, did not cause him to neglect his own countrymen resident in this country. He personally investigated into the state of the Orthodox communities in Manchester, Liverpool, London, and elsewhere, performing Divine Service in their churches and attending to their spiritual wants, as well as to matters of discipline. It is scarcely necessary that we should speak of the impression Archbishop Lycurgos made on all who met him in England, as it will be fresh in the recollection of those who had the privilege of knowing him. It was supposed that the Greek priesthood were generally uneducated, and

therefore it created some surprise when the Bishop who had come with unostentatious simplicity to minister to his own countrymen was found to be an accomplished scholar and a learned theologian, possessed of the highest culture, and thoroughly conversant with the various scientific and social problems of his time.

The impression made on the Archbishop himself by his sojourn in England was freely communicated by him at the time to his friends in Greece; and the opinion he formed of the Church of England, from actual attendance on her services, was favourable to an extent altogether unexpected by himself, and he left England with far higher hopes as to the prospects of reunion than he had previously entertained. His Report to the Holy Synod on his return to Athens sufficiently proves this, and as it is full of interest and is now published with an English translation, we commend it to the attention of our readers. His graphic descriptions show that he was much impressed by the ceremonies for the consecration of bishops and by the cathedral services, and especially by the scene in York Minster, when he stood by the side of the Archbishop of York while the evening office was magnificently rendered and an immense congregation swelled the responses and hymns. He took peculiar interest in the visits he paid to Oxford and Cambridge from his knowledge of foreign Universities, and he was gratified by the honours paid to him by the authorities of both. During his nearly three months' residence amongst us the Archbishop made many friends, with whom he continued his intercourse by letter during the brief remainder of his life. In the month of March he left our shores with bright hopes for the future of our Church, and grateful recollections of the many kindnesses he had met with. He spent a short time in Paris, where the resident Greeks received him with great enthusiasm; but anxious not to delay returning to the duties of his diocese, he soon hastened on to Syros. Two peaceful years now passed over Archbishop Lycurgos in the exercise of his habitual functions; but they were the last he was destined to know unalloyed by trials of a nature very apt to visit men in a public position, but from which he had been until that period more than commonly exempt. The year 1872 brought into his life a bitterness which was keenly felt by him through his remaining days, inasmuch as he then experienced for the first time the censure of many of his countrymen for the line of conduct which he thought it right to pursue.

An important question had for a considerable time been

under discussion between the Christians of Bulgaria and the Patriarch of Constantinople. It had been envenomed by Russian intrigues and Panslavistic ideas ; till it was absolutely necessary to put an end to the difficulty by some definite decision ; and the Archbishop was deputed to go to Constantinople as the representative of Greece, to give the Patriarch his counsel and assistance in bringing the matter to a termination. It was by no means an easy task, as the following explanation will show.

The Orthodox Church in Bulgaria had always been under the Patriarchate, as was the rule also in every other Turkish province. Some years previously the Bulgarians had complained to the Patriarch that it was a hardship for them to have their Church offices administered by Greek clergy whose language they did not understand, and asked to have Bulgarian priests to conduct the services in their own tongue. The Patriarch replied, in the first instance, that he always sent Bulgarians when he could find any capable of ministering to them, and that he would continue to do so, but that he could not help sending Greek priests to localities where no Bulgarian clergy existed. An agitation was then raised to induce influential persons in Bulgaria to demand that their Church should be placed under a separate local head, who, with the sanction of the Patriarch, should govern it entirely. At this juncture the matter might have been easily settled, as the Bulgarians, while asking for a reasonable amount of independence, had not the least desire to separate themselves from the mother Church ; but the question was hopelessly embittered by party spirit raging at Constantinople, where the Greeks were always fighting against the idea of Russian ascendancy, and the Patriarch was induced to refuse his sanction. The Bulgarians then elected an independent head called the Exarchos of Bulgaria, whose appointment was recognised by the Sultan. At this crisis the Archbishop came to Constantinople, and to his influence it was attributed that the Patriarch finally declared the Bulgarian Church to be in schism, in which unhappy position she remains to the present day. This decision was deplored by the great majority in Greece, as it still is by many whose good opinion was very precious to the Archbishop. Probably the more disappointment was felt at the Archbishop's course because in his own diocese, when any question arose between Church and State, his policy had always been that of conciliation, recognising fully the powers of the State in matters of administration, while allowing no interference in matters of doctrine. Whether the censure

thus passed on the Archbishop by public opinion were just or unjust, we cannot doubt that his course was greatly due to the memory of his father, who had spent so much of his life in resisting the encroachments of foreign Powers on the Orthodox Church. The Archbishop returned to his diocese pained and troubled by all that had occurred, while his depression of spirits was aggravated by a consciousness of failing health ; and he was soon after seized by a severe pulmonary attack from which he never wholly recovered. But though aware from that time of the fatal malady which ultimately terminated his life, he not only laboured, whenever possible, at his ordinary duties, but he commenced also the composition of a great theological work, a 'History of Dogmas,' which would have been a valuable book had he lived to complete it.

In the summer of 1875 the Archbishop was urgently pressed from many quarters to attend the Reunion Conference at Bonn in the August of that year. His strong sympathy with the cause of reunion, and the hopes with which he had been inspired during his visit to England, all prompted him to accept the invitation ; but his health was so precarious that he had reluctantly decided against it, when a letter from Mr. Gladstone urging him to give the weight of his influence to the important issues at stake, caused him to make the effort as a last sacrifice in his Master's cause. It must have been a satisfaction to him to find that if the confidence of his countrymen had been to some slight degree shaken at the time of the Bulgarian difficulty, all recollection of it had apparently vanished in the universal gratification at his consenting to represent the Eastern Church at Bonn ; while there was much quaint simplicity in the view taken by the great majority of the nature of his mission. 'He goes,' they said, 'to tell that great assembly that we are the only real old Catholics, and none but ourselves have any right to the name, we, who have been Catholic and orthodox from the very beginning, and who have never admitted one hair's breadth of change under any unauthorised names of development or reform.'

Meanwhile, when it became known at Bonn that Archbishop Lycurgos was to be present, all the 'Orthodox' clergy assembled there—Russians, Greeks, Slavonians, and Serbians—unanimously elected him their President. The Archbishop was the more willing to nerve himself for the effort because he was aware that the question which would chiefly occupy the attention of the assembly was that of the *Filioque*, concerning which he had already held so many anxious conferences in England. The journey tried him severely, and

when he arrived in Bonn he was scarcely able to speak above a whisper. He had interviews at once with some of the Orientals, but his first public appearance was at the Fifth Conference, on August the 13th. It was then decided to appoint a Committee consisting of two or three persons from each of the three parties—Orientals, Anglicans, and Germans—who were to formulate propositions expressing the common convictions of the whole assembly: the Archbishop was appointed to serve on that Committee, which held its first meeting on the following day. It is unnecessary here to enter on the proceedings of the six days of the Reunion Conference. Professor Reusch's Report, edited by Dr. Liddon, leaves nothing to be desired from its fulness of detail, and is no doubt in the hands of most of our readers. In that record the only words stated to have been publicly spoken by the Archbishop are given in the following sentence, prefaced by the touching remark that his voice was so weak he could only be heard by those who were quite close to him, and therefore Bishop Reinkens repeated what he said to the meeting: 'In the name of all those of my own Communion I thank you, Mr. President, for your marvellous efforts in the work of reuniting the severed Churches—of bringing together again the so numerous divisions of the Rock of our Redeemer: our joy is full, and there will be great joy in our homes also. We earnestly pray God for his further blessing.' The joy of which the Archbishop spoke was caused by the agreement in six articles of faith with which the Reunion Conference so happily terminated; and those who were present throughout the deliberations can best tell how far he was himself instrumental in this remarkable result. In Greece, however, in those homes which he said were to be made joyful thereby, it is generally believed that it was his influence which procured the agreement of the Westerns to the *second* article and that of the Easterns to the *third*.¹

¹ The following are the articles referred to above:—

2. The Holy Ghost does not issue out of the Son (*ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ*), because in the Godhead there is but one Beginning (*ἀρχή*), one Cause (*αἰτία*), through which all that is in the Godhead is produced.—*De Fide Orthod.* i. 8: *ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ δὲ τὸ Πνεῦμα οὐ λέγεται, Πνεῦμα δὲ Υἱοῦ ὀνομάζομεν.*

3. The Holy Ghost issues out of the Father through the Son (*De Fide Orthod.* i. 12: *τὸ δὲ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐκ πατορικῆς τοῦ κρυφίου τῆς θεότητος δύναμης τοῦ Πατρὸς, ἐκ Πατρὸς μὲν δι' Υἱοῦ ἐκπορευομένη. Ibidem: Υἱοῦ δι' Πνεύματος, οὐκ ὡς ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἀλλ' ὡς δι' αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον. Manich. n. 5: διὰ τοῦ Λόγου αὐτοῦ ἐξ αὐτοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ ἐκπορευόμενον. De Hymno Tris Ag. n. 28: Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ λόγον προϊόν).* The following is the subsequent addition made by the

With this last effort for the peace of Christ's Church on earth Archbishop Lycurgos' life of labour virtually terminated, and he returned from Bonn to his own country in a most feeble and suffering state. It had been his intention to go to his own residence in Syros; but he landed first in Athens for a few days' rest, and there his strength failed so rapidly that he became unable to undertake even the short voyage home. The last few weeks of his life were therefore passed in the house of his sister Cleopatra, Madame Mariellon, in that city; and it was well for him no doubt that, contrary to his intention, he was detained in Athens, as it secured to him her devoted care and attention through the sad time of weakness and pain which followed. She watched over him unremittingly. She knew, as did also the Archbishop, that the malady must eventually prove fatal; but the end was startlingly sudden. Archbishop Lycurgos was calm and cheerful throughout his illness, while using every means offered by his Church or prompted by his own devout mind to prepare for death. On Thursday, October 16 (O.S.), he was not more ill than he had been for some time previously; and on that day he received a letter from Mr. Gladstone which gave him very great pleasure. He read it over three times, and spoke with satisfaction of having the papers on the Bonn Conference which accompanied it translated to him. It was the last gleam of brightness any earthly joy was to afford him. On the following day, Friday, the 17th (O.S.), about nine in the evening he was lying calmly on his couch conversing with his sister, in the full possession of all his faculties, and with his mind perfectly clear and composed. At a pause in the conversation he asked Madame Mariellon to give him a little soup. She went towards a table at the other side of the room in order to get it; and as she moved away she suddenly heard her brother say softly *τετέλεσται*—*It is finished*. Instantly she returned to his side; but in that one brief moment the great change had been accomplished—Alexander Lycurgos had passed away from this mortal life without a sigh, and without the slightest indication of struggle or pain. His sister, as she bent over the calm countenance, could scarcely believe that he no longer breathed, and sought to restore him. It was in vain. He who so laboured for the unity of the Church on earth had

Orientalists to enable them to accept the article:—*Hom. in Sabb.* s. n. 4: τοῦτ' ἡμῖν ἐστὶ τὸ λατρευόμενον . . . Πνεῦμα ἁγίου τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς, ὡς ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἐκπορευόμενον, ὅπερ καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ λέγεται, ὡς δι' αὐτοῦ φανερούμενον καὶ τῇ κτίσει μεταδιδόμενον, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἔχον τὴν ὑπαρξιν.

gone where we may well hope the true 'Vision of Peace' will surely gladden his longing eyes for evermore.

The tidings of the Archbishop's death caused universal mourning in Athens, and still deeper sorrow throughout his extensive diocese; while in England the sense of the loss sustained by the Church was deeply felt and touchingly expressed by Mr. Gladstone in the following letter to the Rector of the University at Athens:—

'Hawarden Castle,
Nov. 1, 1875.

'Mr. Rector,'—I have received with the deepest regret the sad news of the death of the Archbishop of Syra; and yet all my personal feelings for the distinguished prelate, all my recollections and individual impressions, are almost obliterated by the sentiment of a loss difficult to measure, not only to the Hellenic race and Church, but to the whole of Christendom.

'I received on Saturday last the telegram which you had the extreme kindness to send me, but by accident the indication from whence it came had been omitted in the copy, so that it is only to-day that I can thank you for sending it, and express to you how much with my whole heart and soul I share your feelings. As to the departed, he has surely gone to the rest of the just—to his home in Paradise. *Requiescat in pace.* I believe that the fatigues of his journey and his labours at the Synod of Bonn exhausted his already feeble strength. But how glorious is such a death! How illustrious the martyr to peace and love! May the Almighty raise up among your fellow-countrymen, and elsewhere, successors, truly apostolic, to the sacred cause and work of the departed. I believe that in Greece his memory will not fail to be perpetuated in some national and popular form, and in that case I shall beg also to be allowed to take my part therein. No one better than myself will keep in remembrance his great character, his distinguished intelligence, and the valued friendship with which he honoured me.

'I remain, Mr. Rector, with the assurance of my great consideration, your obedient, humble servant,

'W. E. GLADSTONE.'

Although the Archbishop had died in Athens, the people of Syros so urgently entreated that he might be laid to rest among them that the Government consented to allow it. The ceremonial which up to that time had always been used at the funeral of a Greek Bishop was peculiar. The body, clothed in the episcopal robes, was seated on a throne, the black veil falling back to leave the face exposed; the left hand held the book of the Gospel open on the knees, the right was uplifted in the act of blessing. The throne, raised on the shoulders of eight priests, was borne through the streets to the

¹ The above letter has twice passed through the process of translation.

place of burial amid the chanting of funeral hymns; while the people, as it passed, made the sign of the cross, and bent low to receive the blessing of the deceased. This singular spectacle was very solemn and impressive; but Lycurgos, when he felt that life was failing him, had shrunk, in his humility and refinement of spirit, from a mode of burial which seemed to carry earthly pomp and state into the shades of death, and specially requested that this ceremonial, to which his ecclesiastical dignity entitled him, might be omitted, and his funeral conducted like that of an ordinary priest. His petition was granted by the Holy Synod; and it had a result he could little have anticipated. The fact that one so good and wise as Archbishop Lycurgos had objected to this mode of burial caused the matter to be taken into consideration by the authorities, and an edict has just been published prohibiting the custom for the future. Alexander Lycurgos was placed in a simple coffin, the lid of which was carried before him. He was clothed in his usual robes, with the *ăšpos* (chalice veil) covering his face. The funeral procession was accompanied to the Piræus by the whole clergy of Athens, while a vast concourse of people followed to pay their last tribute of respect to him who was leaving for ever the city where his blameless youth had given such fair promise of the noble career which now shed lustre on his name. Bathed in the sunshine of that bright October day, the long train wound its way to the sea, while the olive groves bordering the route echoed with the wailing dirge chanted by the priests as they moved slowly on. At the Piræus a war steamer was ready to receive the body, which was placed on board in charge of delegates from the Holy Synod and from Syros. Crowds thronged the shores of that island when the vessel arrived which brought back to them the beloved father whose voice, now silent, had ever taught them of life beyond the grave. And as he was borne through their streets, first to the church for the last rites, and thence to the burial-place, the people wept and lamented, struggling to press their lips to the hand that had so often blessed them. The funeral oration was pronounced over the grave by Archimandrite Methodius Papanastasopoulos, Director of the Episcopal School at Syros, a man well fitted for that sad duty by the love that had bound him to his father in the faith. Then all who were permitted drew near to the familiar form about to be hid from their eyes, in order to give the *τελευταίος ἀσπασμός*—the last kiss—with which in Greece it is the custom that human affection should set its seal on the final separation from its dead.

Alexander Lycurgos lies at rest in the public cemetery at Syros—canopied simply by the blue sky of his native land, with nothing to distinguish his honoured grave from those around him ; but the office of his commemoration will never be omitted in the Church where he ministered so long, and his name will still live with a potent influence for good in the hearts of his grateful people.

ART. IV.—THE MONASTERIES AND RELIGIOUS HOUSES OF DEVONSHIRE.

1. *Monasticon Diæcesis Exoniensis.* By GEORGE OLIVER, D.D. (London, 1846.)
2. *Transactions of the Devonshire Association*, 1875. 'The Cistercian Houses of Devon.' By J. BROOKING ROWE.

AMONG the most striking changes in the external appearance of this country since the introduction of Christianity, must be reckoned the dissolution, and the consequent destruction, of the great monasteries. In most cases, even where the church of the convent has been allowed to remain, either entire or in ruin, the domestic buildings which gave distinction to the church, and marked it as monastic, have been so completely swept away that it is difficult to reconstruct the perfect group, even in imagination. Yet it is clear that, not only from their numbers, but from their extent and stately architecture, the houses of the different religious orders in England were among the first objects, when they stood in all their completeness, to attract the notice of a stranger; and one traveller, who passed through the country towards the end of the fifteenth century, speaks of them as 'the pride and glory of the land.' The provinces of the Roman Empire, before the irruption of the Northern conquerors, when temple, and arch, and tower rose everywhere in their full splendour, and the reflected magnificence of the capital was almost universal, can hardly have differed more remarkably from the same provinces after fire and sword had done their work, and arch and temple had been shattered, than the England of 1600 differed from the England of a hundred years before.

There was perhaps no part of Europe in which religious houses of various degrees of importance, and of various orders,

were more thickly scattered than throughout England. A common bond of course united monasteries of the same order, and a Benedictine or a Cistercian might journey from Devonshire to Northumberland, and find himself at home each night among monks of his own habit. Yet a Tavistock Benedictine, who at last reached his brethren at Durham, or a Cistercian from Buckfast who claimed the hospitality of Melrose, would have been struck by certain differences, at least in the external appearance of the monasteries, although the rule within was of course the same. But the massive walls of Durham,

‘Half house of God, half castle ’gainst the Scot,’

and the no less strong crenellations and battlements which protected the famous monastery on the Tweed, indicated something to which the Devonshire monk was altogether a stranger. The chief enemies he had to fear or to guard against were ‘winter and rough weather.’ Those great northern abbeys were exposed to constant danger, as well from the much ruder and fiercer character of the northern English, as from incessant Border warfare. Many of them were defended accordingly; and royal licences ‘to crenellate’—that is, to fortify the house, and to turn it more or less completely into a castle—were granted to the ‘abbot and convent’ as freely as to any great secular lord in the same district. The additional strength given to buildings designed for men whose rule of life was entirely peaceful becomes more and more noticeable in proceeding northward from the Humber. This is the feature which especially characterises the North. But more than one part of England affords something very distinctive in the grouping and the character of its religious houses; due sometimes to the circumstances under which Christianity was introduced in the district, sometimes to the ancient divisions of the kingdom, and sometimes to the natural features of the country. Certain orders affected remote and solitary stations; and where these were easily found,—where wild hill and wide-spreading heath afforded the desert wilderness so much desired—there the houses of such orders occur, as might have been expected, with greater frequency. This is one cause for the number of Cistercian houses in Yorkshire; where the long, winding dales in which they are for the most part situated, were, at the time of their foundation, the roughest and most completely desert places;—as Rievaulx is described, *vastæ solitudinis et horroris*—waste solitudes, full of terrors,—not so much of human origin as arising from the evil spirits which were believed to haunt such remote and untrodden wilder-

nesses. There were, no doubt, other causes,¹ besides the advantage of the country, which led to the spread of the Cistercians in ancient Northumbria; but they resulted altogether in producing, within no very great distances of each other, the most remarkable group of Cistercian abbeys in England—remarkable for their beauty and importance in the days of their full life, and for the great extent of their picturesque ruins at present. In the same manner, in and on the borders of the fen country of eastern England, through which the Ouse, the Nen, and their tributaries wind their slow way toward the sea, were assembled some of the most famous and wealthy of the Benedictine monasteries. Ely, S. Edmund's at Bury, Crowland, Peterborough, Thorney, and Ramsey, all lie near together, and of some the halidoms almost joined. The houses of S. Ætheldrythe at Ely, for instance, and of S. Edmund at Bury, were connected by the causeway of Soham; and similar raised roads, all of monastic construction, ran through the fens from Peterborough to Ely and from Peterborough to Crowland. Here, too, the wild and difficult nature of the country was at first the great inducement to the hermits and recluses who settled in it. This vast tract of

¹ Among the conditions which especially influenced Cistercian foundations in the North, two were of great importance. Thurstan, Archbishop of York (1114-1140) was the personal friend and correspondent of S. Bernard; and except S. Bernard himself, was the greatest reviver of Monasticism of his time. It was at his especial instance, and under his patronage, that the great houses of Rievaulx, of Byland, and of Fountains were founded and fostered. The monks who colonised Rievaulx were sent into Yorkshire by S. Bernard, in the hope that Thurstan would provide them with a resting place; and Fountains had been the Archbishop's own property. Thurstan himself, a few days before his death, assumed the Cluniac habit in their house at Pontefract; but this was in fulfilment of a vow made at Clugny in his youth. The close connexion of Thurstan with S. Bernard is dwelt on at length by Canon Raine in his *Lives of the Archbishops of York*, vol. i.

A second cause which led to the gathering of so many Cistercian houses in Northumbria, and to their rapid development, was the comparative quiet of northern England during the troubled times of Stephen. The great struggle between him and Matilda went on in the south and west. The north was occasionally disturbed; but all that happened there was 'a mere trifle' compared with the confusion elsewhere (see Freeman, *Norman Conquest*, v. p. 317). Thus Thurstan, and those who acted with him, were enabled to establish their new foundations, and to watch over them, with little interruption; and this in a country where the earlier Benedictine houses had never been numerous; while since the great Danish invasion they had absolutely disappeared. The 'religio Cistellensis, quæ nunc optima via summi in cælum processûs et creditur et dicitur' (we quote the words of William of Malmesbury), was thus readily welcomed in the north, and encountered no serious rival.

marshland formed a sort of march of debateable country between the old English kingdoms of East Anglia and Mercia. The hillocks of firmer ground, which rose in the midst of the marshes, afforded secure dwelling-places, protected, like natural fortresses, by the fens; and at the time when these monasteries were founded—many centuries, it must be remembered, before the rise of the Cistercians—such strongholds, in a district over which the neighbouring kings exercised but doubtful authority, were not a little valued by those who fled to them. Some of these monasteries, like Crowland, rose about the cell and tomb of a hermit who had established himself in the fens. Others, like Peterborough, and perhaps St. Edmundsbury, were founded by the first Christian princes of the adjoining kingdoms. But all are of very early date, and it is owing to their foundation during the earlier years of Christianity in Mercia and East Anglia, that they are all Benedictine houses. At that period the Benedictine was the only religious order in this country. They took kindly to the fens, with their wealth of fish and of wild fowl, and, whilst the great churches of Peterborough and Ely remain to testify to the splendour of the monasteries which once surrounded them, no one even now can explore the comparatively desolate sites of the others without wondering at their numbers, and at the zeal and energy which raised and supported such enormous masses of building in a country so entirely without building material, and so difficult of access.

Thus, in various parts of England, the history of the district is reflected not merely in its religious houses, but also in the grouping and order of them. In Devonshire, on the other hand, we find no such especial grouping. Almost every order is represented in the county, although, as we should expect from its natural fitness, the Cistercians are very prominent, and Devonshire possessed one of the earliest houses of the order,—Buckfast, a colony from Waverley in Surrey—besides the very last which was founded in England, Buckland, near Tavistock. Each lay close under the high land of Dartmoor, in such a secluded valley as S. Bernard, the great patron of the Cistercians, especially affected.

‘Bernardus valles, montes Benedictus amabat,’

the ‘montes,’ or mountain heights, having to be sought at Monte Cassino or at Vallombrosa, rather than in our own country, where the Benedictines were affected by other objects and influences. But the Cistercian houses in Devon-

shire were neither so numerous nor so wealthy as those to be found elsewhere ; and indeed, with the exception of Tavistock, Plympton, and perhaps Ford, none of the Devonshire monasteries were of the first class, although they nearly all belonged to that greater and more wealthy body which was not suppressed until 1539—three years after the dissolution of the lesser abbeys. What does, as we think, distinguish the religious houses of the west is their comparative quiet, and the freedom with which they were left to develop the monastic life in accordance with the rules of the several orders. Some of the monasteries in Devonshire, as elsewhere, became centres, round which considerable towns were formed. This was the origin of one whole class of English towns. But whereas elsewhere, at Bury St. Edmunds, at St. Albans, at Dunstable, and in so many other places where the town grew under the shadow of the abbey walls, we find frequent record of disagreements between the town and the abbey, sometimes rising into great and destructive tumults, there is absolutely no such struggle recorded in Devonshire. The Benedictines and the men of Tavistock never fell out, or at least never came to blows. Plymouth grew and prospered under the care of the Prior and Convent of Plympton ; but the townsmen never attacked the monastery. Near houses of the Cistercian order a town was never allowed to spring up. They remained to the end surrounded by their own pastures and cornland, with but few human dwellings gathered around them. But about them all (with one exception),¹ and about all other Devonshire religious houses, there is no sign of any defence beyond the usual enclosures of a convent, and no indication that there were any enemies to be guarded against. And this was really the case, except in the earlier periods, when the Northmen harried Devonshire, and plundered such monasteries as were then in existence. After the Conquest, the comparative remoteness and isolation of the county secured for it greater rest and tranquillity than was to be found in other parts of England. There were no Robin Hoods wandering through the forests, ready to plunder wealthy abbots or to seduce such undisciplined monks as the curtal friar of Fountains ; and tumults such as Wat Tyler's, which so much

¹ The one exception is Buckland. The royal licence to crenellate that abbey was granted in 1336. Probably, as Mr. Brooking Rowe suggests, 'the fear of the foreigner had something to do with this fortification.' In 1339 the French landed and burnt a great part of Plymouth, from which town Buckland is distant about nine miles. It is quite possible that the grant was never acted upon ; and, at any rate, the abbey was never disturbed by foreigner or native.

affected some of the greater abbeys of eastern England, were almost unknown in the west. There were no borderers to dread ; and houses like Tor, which were near the sea, and so might be held to be in some danger from piratical or hostile descents, did not care to fortify themselves after the fashion of the abbeys in the north. These western monasteries seem in short to have been but little disturbed. They passed on, from one monastic generation to another, with no change, except the addition of fairer buildings, or the raising of larger barns. Each, in its way, became the English home of the Laureate's verses—

‘ all things in order stored,
A haunt of ancient peace,—’

and, as a necessary, and for them a happy result, they have but little history. As Sir Walter Scott remarks of certain Scottish abbeys, few traditions are attached to their ruins, and the legends which spring up like wallflowers about the towers of the baron's castle are rarely found in connexion with the monasteries. The numbers of their inhabitants were recruited, for the most part, from the farms and hamlets which lay round about them ; and the lists of monks at the time of dissolution contain, in many instances, names which are still to be found in the immediate district. This is, of course, not confined to Devonshire ; but its general occurrence here indicates that the monastic life of this part of England was very local, and very much undisturbed.

We shall best understand the distinction between the several orders, and the final condition of monasticism in Devonshire, by considering the different houses according to the historical order of their foundation. Here, as throughout England, monasticism was, to all appearance, contemporary with the introduction of Christianity. The original missionaries to this country were nearly all monks ; and the peculiar arrangement which prevailed only in England, by which the church—in each Saxon kingdom—in which the bishop's see was at first placed, was connected with a monastery, was a result of this condition of the first Christian teachers. Thus it was at Winchester, not only the civil, but the ecclesiastical capital of Wessex—the kingdom in which what is now Devonshire became at last included. A great Benedictine monastery was attached to the cathedral of Winchester. At a very early period Saxon colonists pushed themselves onward, and obtained possession in part of what, up to that

time, had been the British, or the Brito-Roman city of Isca—Exeter. They found, and, as we know, did not disturb Christian churches in the place; for although all vestiges of Romano-British Christianity were swept away in the south and east, this was under the tide of heathen conquest; and the colonists who came to Exeter were themselves Christians. But here as elsewhere there was little sympathy and no real union between the British Christians and the Christian Saxons. The Britons retained their own quarters on the northern side of the city. The Saxons made good their hold on much of the south and west, including all that quarter which is now occupied by the Cathedral and the Close.¹ There, and in all probability on part of the site now covered by the Cathedral, they either obtained possession of an earlier church, or founded one for themselves. This was the first Church of S. Peter in Exeter; and to it, after the fashion of Winchester, and of other primitive ecclesiastical centres, was attached a small monastery. It was in this house that Winfrith of Crediton, the S. Boniface who afterwards became so widely known as the Apostle of Germany, was received, when little more than a child, toward the latter part of the seventh century;² and however insignificant it may have been, we cannot but regard it with very great interest, as the first of the religious houses which afterwards became so important in the west. The rule of life of this monastery was at first not strictly that of S. Benedict, but, as was the case in all these primitive houses, it 'was sufficiently near the Benedictine rule to claim all the rights, privileges, and immunities which were accorded to that.'³ All such houses eventually became truly Benedictine. This of Exeter was refounded or remodelled by Æthelstan in the tenth century. The church of it became at last, when the Devonshire see was removed from Crediton to Exeter in 1050, the cathedral of the diocese; and from it, as from a germ, was developed the mass of noble architecture, which now renders the great church one of the most interesting in this country—the Norman towers lifting themselves like rocks of grey stone into the

¹ The manner in which the city was divided between the two races is clearly indicated in a remarkable paper by Mr. Kerslake, of Bristol, read before the Archaeological Institute, during the meeting of that body at Exeter in 1873. This paper, which is entitled 'The Celt and the Teuton in Exeter,' is printed in the *Archæol. Journal*, vol. xxx.

² There can be no reasonable doubt but that the 'Adescanceastre' of Willibald's *Life of Boniface* signifies Exeter. The 'ad' represents the English 'æt'—often so prefixed.

³ Stubbs, *Const. Hist.* vol. i. p. 222.

air, the successive works of Quivil, of Stapledon, and of Grandisson, which yield in beauty and in grace to nothing in England of their own period. In one sense, therefore, this primitive Church of S. Peter was, from the first, the mother church of Devonshire. Under Leofric, as the place of the bishop's see, it became so altogether. The monastery which belonged to it, restored and endowed as it had been by Æthelstan, suffered much during the frequent attacks on Exeter and the west by the Danes. When Leofric took possession of it in 1050, it had lost nearly all its lands. Only two hydes remained, at Ide; and upon these were only seven head of cattle. There were but three or four monks; and these were removed to the new monastery which the Confessor was building at Westminster, at the very time when he installed Leofric. The monastery at Exeter then disappeared. The monks were replaced by a body of prebendaries; and the cathedral thus takes its place as one of the old foundation; that is, its constitution remained unaltered at the time of the great changes in the sixteenth century.

The place of the Devonshire see was fixed at Crediton about 910. The condition of Wessex had then become greatly changed. New sees, of which Crediton was one, were established for each shire of that kingdom. It was an ecclesiastical division, not an introduction of Christianity; and a monastery, properly so called, was not attached to each new cathedral church. Hence the religious house at Crediton was not monastic, although the church, as served by a body of clerks, receives the name of 'monasterium' in some early documents. These clerks became secular canons, and the church itself was eventually made collegiate. The Saxon bishop at Crediton lived surrounded by his own clergy, clerks, priests and others, who were under a sort of rule; and when Crediton was abandoned for Exeter the church retained a certain dignity, and a body of prebendaries or canons either remained, or was at once connected with it. But there was never a monastery, in the true sense of the word, at Crediton. And, before the Norman Conquest, very few monasteries were established in Devonshire. This was no doubt chiefly owing to the fact that much of the country remained in British hands to a comparatively late period—long after the first zeal of conversion, to which the foundation of so many religious houses was due elsewhere, had passed away among the Saxons. We may not unfairly suppose that the foundations of the two monasteries which, besides that at Exeter, existed in Devonshire before the Conquest, mark the respective periods at which not only Saxon

power had become firmly established, but when the land had passed completely into English hands, west of the Dart and of the Tavy. These two monasteries are Buckfast and Tavistock. Both at first were Benedictine; but Buckfast became Cistercian, under a new foundation, in the twelfth century. The original foundation was due to a personage whom the records of the abbey called 'dux Alfredus'—Alfred the Duke—under which title we are to recognise the ealdorman of the shire. Of the date of foundation we know nothing; and no ealdorman of the Defenas so named appears in any other record. The Abbey of Tavistock was founded about 960 by an ealdorman whose name has been more widely spread—Ordgar, father of Ælfrythe or Elfrida, famous for the romantic and purely mythical story connected with her marriage to King Eadgar. Such was the wealth of Ordgar that, according to the Norman versifier, Geoffrey Gaimar, there was not a town or a city 'from Exeter to Frome' which did not call him master. Ordgar was the founder; but the building of the abbey was finished and the convent was endowed by his son Ordulf. The extraordinary stature and great strength of Ordulf are recorded by William of Malmesbury, no doubt in accordance with traditions preserved at Tavistock. He would often, we are told, bestride a stream some ten feet wide, which ran near his house; and there, with his hunting knife, chop off the heads of such animals as had been taken in the day's chase. On one occasion, when journeying towards Exeter (it is said, in company with King Edward the Confessor, but the dates make this an impossibility), he found the gate of the city, one of those connected with Æthelstan's walls, closed and the doors barred. No porter was at hand, and Ordulf dashed in the doors with his foot, pulling out at the same time part of the wall. The enormous bones still preserved in the church at Tavistock are assigned to this giant, and it is said that they were taken from his tomb; but they are probably not human bones at all; and their real history is a matter of the most complete uncertainty. The dedication of the abbey to S. Mary and S. Rumon marks its position in a district which had been British until a very recent period, and in which British saints were still recognised. Little or nothing is known of S. Rumon beyond the fact of his Celtic origin. His relics were brought from Cornwall by Ordulf, and were enshrined in the church of the new monastery. The church was rebuilt after the Conquest, and no doubt underwent various changes at different times. But of its architectural character, as it existed at the time of the dissolution, we

know absolutely nothing. All we do know is that it was a vast building, by far the largest monastic church in the two western counties, hardly yielding in size to the cathedrals of Wells or of Exeter. Not one stone now remains on another. The total disappearance of great buildings like this is one of the many marvels connected with the destruction of the monasteries; especially in districts like that of Tavistock, where stone is abundant. The labour of destroying massy walls and towers can hardly have been less than that of procuring fresh material from the quarry. In this great church the shrine of S. Rumon stood in the usual position, at the back of the high altar. It was the only shrine of a saint which existed in Devonshire. Exeter possessed none, and not one of the other monastic churches was so enriched. This was owing, in great part, to the time and conditions of the Saxon conquest and colonisation of Devonshire. They came to it when already Christian. In other parts of England the first teachers of Christianity became the principal saints.

The site of Tavistock Abbey must always have been one of great beauty, though hardly so wild or so picturesque as that of Buckfast, to which we shall presently return. But beauty and picturesqueness of site were never thought of by these first monastic settlers. They looked for quiet and security in troubled times; for streams and lakes which might provide plenty of fish; and for such land as might be cleared and cultivated for their corn and cattle. It must not be forgotten that, in most cases, the clearing of the land was the work of the monks themselves. Many a venerable pasture, and many a cornfield which century after century has been duly reaped and its store garnered, were first reclaimed from the wilderness by these 'hooded folk.' They found plenty of such work ready for them on the banks of the Tavy. The river, fresh from its sources on Dartmoor, here becomes considerably broader, while it still retains its rocky and broken channel. The abbey rose close on its banks, and streams from it were conveyed through all the different offices. This we learn from William, the monk of Malmesbury, who visited Tavistock early in the twelfth century, and who describes the place as in every way pleasant—enclosed and sheltered by woods and coppices, and alive with rivulets, which abounded in fish. The trout of the Tavy and its feeders were then undisturbed by mine-works; and many a lordly salmon found its way up the river. The monastery, when William of Malmesbury saw it, was wealthy and prosperous; but like Buckfast and Exeter, it had suffered much

in the earlier period, from the havoc and plunder of the Northmen. In 997, during the life of the first abbot, it was actually destroyed by them. In that year, according to the English Chronicle, they entered the mouth of the Tamar, 'and then went up until they came to Hlidaforda (Lidford); and all things they burned and slew that they found; and Ordulf's minster, at Tafingstoke (Tavistock), they burned up, and brought untold booty with them to their ships.' But the house did not long remain desolate. It received, as its second abbot, a Benedictine from the monastery of S. Swithun, at Winchester—Living or Lyfing, who became the greatest and most powerful churchman of his day in this country. He was the friend and the chief counsellor of Cnut; and in 1032, two years before the death of that great king, he was made by him Bishop of Crediton.¹ Mainly owing no doubt to his great interest with Cnut, he had already done so much towards the rebuilding and enriching of his monastery at Tavistock, that he was regarded as its second founder, and in Malmesbury's time his memory was still fresh there, and services were duly sung for him by the monks, in whose church he was buried. His care for the house at Tavistock may have been greatly due to his own love for the place; but he carried out there the will of Cnut, who, we are expressly told, was careful to make reparation to all such monasteries as had been destroyed or injured by his Danish brethren.² There is no direct evidence that Buckfast had suffered in this way; but we know that it was so from the fact that one of the districts of Zeal, in North Devon, was given to that abbey by Cnut. This became thenceforth known as Zeal Monachorum—Zeal of the Monks. The old Saxon word Zeal or Sele, signifying a hall or dwelling-place, implies that such a house was in existence, and had given name to the land, before it passed into the hands of the Benedictines of Buckfast.

Both of these monasteries, Tavistock and Buckfast, survived the troubles of the Conquest, and their possessions are fully entered in the Domesday Survey. They were then well-endowed houses, holding many outlying manors and townships, which were well stocked. Buckfast was by far the

¹ It was during the episcopate of Lyfing that the Sec of Cornwall was united with that of Crediton (or Devonshire). The union has remained to our own time, and has only just been happily dissolved. Lyfing held the Bishopric of Worcester, together with the two western sees. He was known as the 'wordsnōtera biscop'—the 'eloquent bishop.'

² 'Monasteria per Angliam suis et patris excursionibus partim fœdata, partim eruta, reparavit.'—*W. Malmes.* ii. 181.

less important. The names of its abbots, while the house remained Benedictine, are not preserved. But we should have known more about them had they been men of the stamp of Lyfing of Tavistock, or of his successor Ealdred, who became Archbishop of York, and who, as Archbishop, crowned both Harold and the Conqueror.

The Norman conquest of Exeter and the west brought with it sundry monastic changes. New orders were introduced; and those cells or small religious houses were founded in connexion with and dependent on great foreign monasteries, which were afterwards known as alien priories, and which soon made their appearance throughout the length and breadth of England. It is true that, before the Conquest, Edward the Confessor, with his leaning toward the Normans, had not only raised many of them to high ecclesiastical position in this country, but had also bestowed English lands on many of the great churches in Normandy. Thus, in 1061, he gave the manor and church of Ottery St. Mary to the Church of Rouen, and both remained in the hands of the great chapter of that church until they were bought by Bishop Grandisson in 1335, when the church of Ottery was made by him collegiate. But no monastic cell was founded there after the grant to Rouen. It was not until the Norman conquerors had fully established themselves on the lands which fell to their lot in Devonshire, that such cells were established by them—in recognition, as it were, of their continued interest in the religious houses of what they still regarded as their own country. Thus at Totnes, Judhael founded a cell in connexion with a great Benedictine abbey at Angers. The mighty Earl of Mortain, half-brother of the Conqueror, who had received as his share of the newly conquered land nearly the whole of Cornwall, and a great extent of territory in Devonshire, founded at Modbury a priory attached to the Benedictine house of S. Pierre sur Dive, in the diocese of Seez; and at Ipplepen, Ralph de Fougères, or one of his immediate descendants, established a cell in connexion with the Abbey of Fougères in the diocese of Rennes—a house of Augustinians, or Canons Regular—that is, canons who lived under a monastic rule. These were the first Augustinians who were brought into Devonshire. At Barnstaple, the same Judhael, who founded the Benedictine cell at Totnes, established a more important house—the Priory of S. Mary Magdalene. This was for Cluniac monks, and was made dependent on the great Abbey of S. Martin's-in-the-Fields, at Paris. The charter

of Judhael indicates that he made this foundation with the intention of himself becoming a monk in the priory.¹

It is but a glimpse which we thus get into the inner life of these small Norman priories, but it is one of some interest. Little is known of Judhael or Judhicael of Totnes, although he appears as one of the greater landowners of Devonshire, at the time of the Domesday Survey. He was, probably, as his name suggests, of Breton descent on his mother's side. His father was a certain Auvrai or Alured, called the giant, who had fought in the earlier Norman wars of the Conqueror, and who, after bestowing much wealth on the Norman Abbey of Cerisy, took himself the monastic vows there. Thus the son, at Barnstaple, was following the father's example.

Of the same character as the foundations of these newly-entered Norman lords, were the grants of the Conqueror himself of certain lands in Exeter to the great abbey of 'the place of the Battle,' where the high altar of the church stood on the spot which, during the fight, had been occupied by the standard of Harold. On this land the monks of Battle established the Priory of S. Nicholas; and with the gift of land William also assigned to the Abbey of Battle the church of S. Olaf in Exeter—the church of the Scandinavian saint, which the Danish Gytha, the mother of Harold, had enriched by special gifts for the welfare of the soul of her husband, Godwine. But all these grants and foundations, interesting as they are, and distinctly as they point to the altered condition of the country, were comparatively small, and none of them can have greatly influenced the general life of Devonshire. The introduction of new orders was far more important. Cluniacs, as we have seen, were settled at Barnstaple, and Augustinians at Ipplepen. The Cluniacs were so named from the Abbey of Clugny in Burgundy, the head of the order. They were reformed Benedictines; Benedictines, that is, of somewhat stricter rule than that which had become general, or which custom had made general, in the houses of the parent order. They were never very numerous in England; and their most important house here was the Priory of Lewes, in Sussex, founded by William of Warrene and his wife Gundrada, daughter, not of the Conqueror, but of his Queen Matilda by an earlier marriage. William and Gundrada had been received with unusual hospitality at Clugny, when on

¹ 'Ad quam, Divina providente clementiâ, devotus confugiam, habitum monasticæ religionis suscepturus.' Judhael had founded the Norman castles (so far as they were new foundations) at both Totnes and Barnstaple.

their way to Rome. On their return they founded a priory under the shelter of their castle at Lewes, and filled it with monks from Clugny. This became one of the houses known as the 'five chief daughters' of Clugny; and its wealth at the dissolution was considerable. The two houses of the order in Devonshire were of no such importance. The principal was that at Barnstaple. The other was the Priory of S. James at Exeter, founded by Baldwin de Redvers, Earl of Devon, before the year 1143.

The Augustinians first settled, as we have seen, in their small cell at Ipplepen, became of much greater account among us. The wealthiest monastery in Devonshire, that of Plympton, was Augustinian; and there were in the county three other houses for men of the same order,—Hartland, Frithelstock, and Cornworthy; besides a convent of Augustinian canonesses at Canonsleigh on the Teign.

Frithelstock and Cornworthy were not large. Hartland, like Plympton, was important and wealthy; and its position, closely adjoining the wild northern coast, gives it an especial interest. Augustinian canons were hardly ascetics. Their rule obliged them to a regular, but not a severe, life; and it is somewhat remarkable to find them set down here, in a remote seclusion, such as would have far better suited the desert-loving Cistercians. But there had been a church at Hartland before the foundation of the abbey by Geoffry of Dinham in the reign of Henry the Second. S. Nectan, one of the many sons of Brychan, a Welsh kinglet of the fifth century, had, it is said, established a hermitage and oratory on the rocks, and had died at Hartland. Two of his sisters were S. Morwenna and S. Meriwenna, who also fixed their hermitages on the coast, at Morwenstow and at Marhamchurch. Gytha, the mother of Harold, whom we have already encountered at Exeter, and who was the owner of wide lands in the county of Devon, was, we are told, once on the cliffs of Hartland during a great storm, through which she watched a vessel which carried her husband, Godwine, beating up the Severn sea. The ship was in great danger, but was saved from wreck, as Gytha believed, by the intercession of S. Nectan, whose oratory was near at hand. As a thank-offering she seems to have built a church at Hartland; and she attached to it a body of secular canons, who remained until the foundation of the monastery, which was dedicated to S. Nectan, and held to be under his especial protection. In the hamlets and through the long winding combes which descend to that dangerous coast were scattered many chapels in

connexion with the monastery; and it is difficult to exaggerate the benefits at once to civilisation and to religion which must have followed the foundation and growth of such a convent, at least in its earlier period, in a district so remote and so difficult of approach.

Great part of the cloisters at Hartland, rebuilt, as appears from a remaining inscription, by Abbot John of Exeter, at the beginning of the fourteenth century, still exist, worked into the lower story of the modern house which occupies the site of the abbey. But the mass of building has entirely disappeared; and Hartland, in its comparative solitude, has in this respect fared no better than the far more important monastery of Plympton, which stood in the neighbourhood of a rising town, and in the midst of a somewhat large population. The Augustinian Priory of S. Peter and Paul at Plympton was founded long before Hartland. As at Hartland, there was at Plympton an ancient collegiate church, established, as it seems probable, before the Conquest. Church and manor passed into the hands of William Warlewast, nephew and chaplain of the Conqueror; and soon after they came into his possession he attached them to the see of Exeter. Warlewast became himself Bishop of Exeter in 1107; and it was he who began the rebuilding of the cathedral. He held the see until 1128. In 1121 he removed the secular canons from Plympton to Bosham in Sussex; founded a priory in the place of their collegiate church, and settled in it a colony of Augustinians, or (as they were called from their black habit) black canons. The traveller who approaches Plympton by the modern railway sees little of the beauty of the site, and can hardly appreciate the very great advantages of position which at last made Plympton the wealthiest religious house in the county. But those who come to it by the old high road from Ashburton to Plymouth will recognise at once the great fertility of the long valley at the end of which the monastery stood, fronting the estuary of the Laira, into which the river Plym discharges itself. The riches of both sea and land were thus open to the convent. The valley of Plympton was regarded as one of the most fertile and productive in Devonshire at a very early period; and we find it so described at the beginning of the reign of Stephen, not long after the foundation of the monastery. Picturesque and striking, with the mound of its Norman castle, one of the strongholds of the De Redvers, Earls of Devon, rising in the midst of green meadows,—its tall church towers, and its avenues of stately trees,—a certain shadow of antiquity rests over the whole

scene; and although the few remains of the monastery are not seen at all until closely looked for, there are many indications of the importance which it once possessed. The house of the Augustinians stood close on the left bank of the little Torey brook, and fronted the estuary. The existing Church of Plympton St. Mary was the parish church, belonging to the monastery, and served by its canons. It stood, as was the case elsewhere, at the entrance of the monastic cemetery, which extended on the south of it. The great church of the monastery itself has been utterly swept away. It was built, according to Leland, at the end of the twelfth century, and in it were the stately monuments of many a great lord and benefactor—Courtenays, Strodes, Valletorts—

‘Who loved the Church so well, and gave so largely to ’t,
They thought it should have canopied their bones
Till domesday.’

In the chapter-house was laid the founder of the priory, Warlewast, Bishop of Exeter, who had died here; and another Bishop of Exeter, Robert Warlewast, nephew of the founder. The priors were, many of them, men of far sight and clear judgment; and it was greatly owing to their care and protection that the little fishing hamlet of Sutton, which belonged to them, was developed into an important trading station, and grew into the yet more important town of Plymouth. Great personages landing at Plymouth or compelled to halt there on their way to the French and Spanish coasts (for which it became the most convenient station) were entertained with all hospitality in the Priory of Plympton. The Black Prince was here more than once; and he rested for some weeks at the priory when he landed at Plymouth in 1370, broken in health, having left Aquitaine for the last time. It is hardly possible to conceive the wonderful difference in the picture, when this great monastery, with all her towers, courts, and cloisters, rose in full perfection at the head of the broad sea inlet, enringed by sunny meadows, and backed, in the far distance, by the grey crests of Dartmoor. Of all her beauty and dignity, of all the vast offices and noble chambers which once surrounded her, the sole remains are the refectory and kitchen, the former of which, as was usual, occupied one side of the great cloister. The refectory, a building of early English date, 61 feet in length, by 14 feet wide, is raised above an undercroft or substructure of Norman character. This may very well be part of Warlewast's work,—a sole surviving fragment of the building which he raised at the time of the foundation of the monastery. The kitchen, beyond

the refectory, is detached, and belongs to the fifteenth century. The seal of the house deserves notice. It displayed the Blessed Virgin with the Divine Infant seated on her lap; and bearing on her wrist a hawk, hooded and belled. This was a mark of especial feudal dignity; but it is most unusual to find it assigned in this manner to sacred personages. No mark of dignity, it was perhaps held, was too great for such an important house, the influence of which was so widely extended, and the wealth of which was so great. At the dissolution, the yearly revenue of Plympton is given as 912*l*. This must be multiplied at least fifteen times to bring it to the present standard: but these returns give us little insight into the real wealth of the monasteries, or of their full revenues. From the leiger books of such a great house as that of Fountains in Yorkshire we obtain a much better idea of the monastic resources; and if, after due comparison, we set down the income and supplies of Plympton as representing about 30,000*l*. a year at present, we shall not perhaps be very far wrong.

Less wealthy in Devonshire than the Augustinians, though elsewhere, and especially in the North of England, their houses were of very great size and importance, and their lands stretched away for many a mile together, were the Cistercians, or white monks; so called from the white woollen habit which they wore. They appeared for the first time in Devonshire in 1133; in which year a company of monks from Waverley, in Surrey, was settled at Brightley, in the parish of Okehampton, by Baldwin de Brionne, lord of the castle there. Waverley was the first Cistercian house in England; and it had only been established five years when this offset was taken from it. The position of Waverley—a name which has become a household word among us, for there can be no doubt but that it was when turning through the annals of this house that the musical sound approved itself to the ear of Sir Walter Scott—the position of Waverley, in a broad green meadow, round which the river Wey, overlooked by low wooded hills, winds on three sides—thus forming one of those valleys

‘ . . . silvestribus undique cinctas
Arboribus . . .’

in which the order especially delighted, is one of extreme beauty. That of Brightley did not please the new colony. They declared, with little of the true Cistercian fervour, that as nothing grew there but heather and wild thyme, they were unable to support themselves. Their founder, Richard de Brionne, died

in 1137. No one appeared to help them; and, at length, they determined to return to Waverley. They set out on their journey, and had reached Thorncombe, about two miles from Axminster, when they were met by messengers from Adelia de Brionne, sister and heiress of the lord of Okehampton, directing them to take possession of her house at Westford, and giving them the manor of Thorncombe for their living. The building of an abbey was at once begun; and thus arose the Cistercian house of Ford, which afterwards became the richest monastery of its order in Devonshire—if it is fairly to be considered as within the county. In the meantime, in 1137, another Cistercian house, Buckfast, had been founded—or had been changed from Benedictine to Cistercian—by one of the Pomeroyes; and as this abbey underwent no changes, it may fairly be considered as the first Cistercian house established in Devon.

Like the earlier order of the Cluniacs, the Cistercians were reformed Benedictines, adhering, as they believed, with the utmost strictness to the primitive rule of S. Benedict. The zeal of all monastic bodies seems gradually to die away, or to become extinguished by that relaxation of severe rule which invariably prevails after a time. Thus it had been with the Benedictines—the great order to which Europe owes so much. In many of their houses, at the beginning of the twelfth century, the ancient rule was hardly observed at all. Even the habit of their order was neglected; and, in some places—at Durham for example—the dress, instead of the black prescribed by S. Benedict, was of all colours; at any rate, the monks are so represented in the illuminations of the magnificent Bible which was prepared in the monastery of Durham under the direction of Bishop Hugh de Puiset, and which still remains there. Reformers accordingly arose: S. Hugh at Clugny; S. Bernard—one of the greatest names of mediæval times—to protect and to direct the new order which had established itself at Cîteaux (Cistercium), also in Burgundy. From this parent house of Cîteaux the order took its name; and the actual founder of Cîteaux was a monk from the diocese of Exeter—Stephen or Harding. We cannot trace the family to which he belonged, although his name is still well known among us;¹ but it gives an additional interest to the

¹ Harding was his baptismal name; Stephen that which he took on entering religion. 'Is fuit Hardingus nomine, apud Anglos non ita reconditis natalibus procreatus.'—*Will. Malmes.* iv. 334. He is afterwards referred to as 'Hardingus qui et Stephanus.' He had been a monk at Sherborne, and afterwards at Molesmes, in the diocese of Langres.

Cistercian monasteries founded in the county, when we remember that Cîteaux itself was first ruled by an abbot from Devonshire. The zeal and simplicity of life of these earliest Cistercians—aided as they were by the burning eloquence and the wide-spread fame of S. Bernard, who himself became abbot of Clairvaux, one of the first of the daughter houses founded from Cîteaux—took deep hold on the better spirits throughout Europe. The order spread rapidly and everywhere. Great barons like Walter of Espec in Yorkshire, or the Pomeroyes in the west, gave them fitting sites on which to establish their new colonies; and the sound of their constant bells rose from many a wild valley and remote wilderness which it was their task to bring into cultivation. The Cistercian order, if not the wealthiest in England, soon became one of the most influential. They did not profess learning, as the Benedictines did—a profession which they have well maintained; but a part of the Cistercian rule was the daily labour of each monk in the fields belonging to his house. They became the great farmers and the great sheepmasters of the country. The wool in their storehouses was at one time seized by King John—a proof of the wealth and importance which by that time they had acquired. Each Cistercian monastery was in fact a school of agriculture for the whole surrounding district; and if, as time went on, they too relaxed the severity of their rule, and their houses became little more than the abodes of comfortable country gentlemen, they only submitted to the law which seems to be a natural law of monasticism; and their monasteries, at the time of the dissolution, were by no means in the worst condition among those which were visited by the ruthless commissioners of Cromwell.

The two greatest Yorkshire houses of the Cistercians, Rievaulx and Fountains, were established during the lifetime of Stephen Harding and of S. Bernard. Both these men were living, too, when the Cistercians first appeared at Brightley, in Okehampton; and S. Bernard was still labouring at Clairvaux, when Buckfast, in 1137, was founded by Ethelwerd de Pomeroy. The foundation of Brightley, as we have seen, reappeared at Ford; and much of the very picturesque house which now exists there is formed from the domestic buildings of the abbey, with such additions and alterations as it pleased Inigo Jones and later architects to devise. Two very distinct periods appear in the monastic work here, representing the beginning and the end, and displaying in a very striking manner the change which at last came over the severe, simple Cistercians. By their rule, every kind of ornament was ban-

ished from their churches and domestic buildings. No carved foliage enwreathed their columns, and no grotesque figures looked down from buttress or from pinnacle. They were, at the beginning, as has been well said, the Quakers of the Middle Ages; and they held in horror the elaborate sculpture and painting with which even the reformed order of Clugny did not hesitate to adorn its churches. The earlier work of the Cistercians, utterly and severely plain, is nevertheless most striking, and the long simple lines of the ruined church of Fountains or of Kirkstall show how much may be effected in architecture by harmony of parts alone. The first work at Ford is of this character, dating, as it does, from the latter half of the twelfth century. It includes the chapter-house of the monks, now converted into a chapel, a long undercroft, probably the frater or day-room of the brethren, and the monks' dormitory above it. The whole is without ornament. The range of dormitory windows is entirely plain, and there is no evidence that they were ever glazed. There are not even traces of wooden shutters. Such severity might very well have been endured in the earlier days of the order; but we can hardly suppose that it continued unmitigated to the last. For at Ford, as elsewhere, the later builders set at nought all this austerity of rule. S. Bernard had expressly provided that no towers were to be connected with Cistercian churches. But at the beginning of the sixteenth century the Abbot of Fountains raised the great tower which still dominates the valley, and enriched it with carved inscriptions. At Ford, the last abbot, Thomas Chard, built a very fine central tower with deep oriels, leading on one side into a magnificent hall, and on the other to a long cloistral passage. All this work is much decorated, and has become almost secular in its general character—remarkably illustrating the change which by that time had come, not indeed to the Cistercians alone, but to all the monastic orders.

The site of Ford, among green meadows, with much wood, answers in much to the Cistercian ideal; but by no means so completely as that of Buckfast. Buckfast, as we have seen, had been at first a Benedictine abbey. It certainly survived the Conquest. But from some causes, of which we have no account, it had been either dissolved, or like the Exeter convent, in the time of Lcofric, the number of its monks had become greatly diminished, when it was refounded by Ethelwerd de Pomeroy in 1137, and, like Ford, received a colony of Cistercians from Waverley. From the high ground above Buckfast, the castle of the Pomeroy, on its scarped rock in

the midst of thick woods, is visible in the far distance. The site of Buckfast itself was far more fitting for the quiet-seeking, hard-labouring white monks than for the Benedictines; and of all the Devonshire monasteries it most recalls the wild and picturesque positions of the great Yorkshire houses. It stood—its scanty ruins yet stand—on the right bank of the Dart, where the river winds under a steep, wooded hill, and leaves a broad stretch of green meadow between itself and the much steeper hills that rise, crest on crest, toward the open moorland. The river is here in the middle portion of its course, between the wilder scenes where it sparkles and dashes among huge masses of broken granite, under Benjay Tor and the woods of Buckland, and the more cultivated and richer, but hardly less striking country through which it passes below Staverton and Totnes. Above the site of the abbey, and beyond the meadows, tufted with patches of coppice, and still known as the ‘monk’s walk,’ oak woods and coppices of birch close in the stream on either side, and far away, over the wide, wooded landscape, the rocky peaks of Dartmoor rise gray in the distance. Nothing can well be imagined more truly monastic, more full of quiet peace and seclusion, than the whole of this valley in the earlier days of the Cistercian house, when the white monks were still workers, and the life of the convent was still true to its rule. The great church, whose ruins at the end of the last century, in the words of a Devonshire historian, ‘moved all beholders to wonder and pity,’ rose, the centre and protection of the whole monastery. Round it were grouped the various buildings of such a house: the cloister of the monks, the abbot’s lodging, the various guest-chambers, and the outer offices, the great barns or ‘spicaria’ (to use the true monastic term), of which one noble example still remains, and which were especially prominent in the establishments of the agricultural Cistercians. The meadows lay green and sunny round the monastery. The river murmured onward close to the eastern end of the church. Little crofts of arable and patches of corn land, won hardly from the rough brake and coppice, showed where cultivation was stealing up the hillsides; and here and there, on the farther heights, the cross rose against the sky—‘signa,’ says a charter of the abbey, ‘Christiano digna.’ The scene is still most beautiful, in spite of its later adornments and associations. The ruins of the church were used early in the century for building a factory; and on the site of the abbot’s house has arisen a modern abbey, of very different character from that

known by the Cistercians. But the valley and the meadows are little changed; and we may still mark the greensward of the 'abbot's way'—a tract so called that winds over the moors, between the fern and the heather, from Holne Lee to Brent—both of which manors belonged to the abbey. These moors, lying outside the ring of the royal forest, were the Cistercian sheep-tracks; answering here to the wide fells and mountain pastures over which ranged the flocks belonging to Fountains or to Rievaulx. The house of Buckfast possessed much land in different parts of the county; and there was a cell at Leigh, not far from Kingsbridge, in which the abbot always passed the season of Lent, during which time he secluded himself from the business of the monastery.

Besides Ford and Buckfast, there were three other Cistercian houses in the county: Dunkeswell, in a remote valley near Hemyock, founded by William, Lord Briwere, in 1201; Newenham, near Axminster, founded by Reginald de Mohun, in 1246, and colonised from Beaulieu in Hampshire, whence the future abbot, twelve monks, and four lay brethren, proceeded on foot, taking four days for the journey; and Buckland, the foundation of Amicia, Countess of Devon, in 1278. Newenham was an important abbey, and some fragments of the monastic church still remain; but Buckland is especially noticeable, not only for the great beauty of its site, on the bank of the Tavy, or for the later connexion of the place with Sir Francis Drake, who worked into the existing house part of the monastic church—the arches of the great crossing being still to be seen in the attics—but from the fact that it was the last house of the Cistercian order founded in England. The earlier simplicity of architecture had greatly passed away at the time of its foundation. Fragments of sculpture are to be seen in portions of the building, and on one carved boss the head of the foundress, the Countess Amicia, seems to be represented. The ground-plan too of the church and of the monastic buildings, in so far as it can be ascertained, seems to be altogether unusual. But if in these respects the directions of S. Bernard were no longer followed, the Cistercians of Buckland were as thoroughly farmers—perhaps not labourers—as others of their order. Their moorland sheep-walks stretched quite to the boundary of the forest—a great distance from their convent; and Syward's Cross—the 'Crux Sywardi' of the monastic charters—marked the limit at once of the forest of Dartmoor and of the lands of Buckland Abbey. This cross, remotely placed, and rarely visited, is one of the most ancient on the Dartmoor border, and it is

the only cross in Devonshire which bears any words or inscription. On one side is the name of Syward; on the other what seems to be the word 'Bond'—indicating that the cross was a bound-stone. Syward, to all appearance, although we know nothing of him from any other source, had been the owner of the extra-forestal moors at some time before they passed into the hands of the monks. The words are carved in Lombardic letters, and both cross and inscription are considerably more ancient than the foundation of the abbey.

We have followed the history of the Cistercian houses in Devonshire to its close, not only because the order was one of so great interest in itself, but because it differed so positively from those which preceded and followed it. But before the foundation of the later Cistercian monasteries, a remarkable abbey of Premonstratensian canons had arisen on the shore of Torbay, which in the dignity and extent of its buildings must have been one of the most striking in Devonshire. It was the richest house of its order in England; but in this county the wealth of Plympton and of Tavistock far exceeded that of Tor. The house was founded by William, Lord Briwere, in the reign of Richard I.—probably about 1190. In picturing to ourselves the abbey, as it existed until the dissolution, we must sweep away all the buildings and the stir of life which have made that once lonely shore one of the centres of western civilisation, and which have converted the 'peere and socour for fischar botes,' which Leland describes as belonging to the abbey, into the far extending town of Torquay. At the end of the twelfth century the place was almost a solitude. Dartmouth, it is true, was at that time the great harbour of the west; but the crusading fleets and the merchant vessels which frequented it only gave something like life to the distant sea, in so far as the Canons of Tor were concerned. The order was one of great severity, and was named from the valley of Premontr  in the diocese of Laon, where the mother house had been established by S. Norbert, in 1121. The canons abstained altogether from flesh meat, and wore no linen. Other orders admitted the laity to some portion at least of their churches. The Premonstratensians excluded them altogether. They had no processions, and all their ceremonies were conducted in the simplest and most severe fashion. Their churches were long parallelograms, and without aisles, since they needed none, either for processions or for a congregation. This was their earliest condition, and the remains of one of these aisleless churches may still be

examined at Bayham in Sussex. But, like all other orders, they at last relaxed the austerity of their rule; and the buildings and fragments which exist at Tor show plainly enough that they no more despised or neglected splendour of architecture than the later Cistercians.

The houses of such severe orders as the Premonstratensians or Cistercians rarely became aristocratic abbeys, and were but little resorted to by those younger sons of great families who looked forward to the position of Lord Abbot, or who cared to lead a life of dignified ease in the guise and under the name of monks. In Devonshire, Tavistock, during its later period, was the house most affected by such questionable religious. The Benedictine rule, relaxed as it had been, was no very extreme restraint; and from the year 1334, when John of Courtenay, son of the second Earl of Devon of that house, became abbot, Tavistock assumed more and more the position of the most distinguished and the most secular monastery of the West. The abbot ruled the borough with ample authority. In his hands was the entire jurisdiction of the hundred; and early in the reign of Henry VIII. he was raised by Pope Leo X. to the dignity of a Mitred Abbot, and was thus made independent of both Bishop and Archbishop. John of Courtenay was a great hunter—loving

‘—The deer to track

More than the lines and the letters black.’

He delighted more in the hunting lodges and outlying granges of the abbey,—such as Morwell or Endsleigh—than in the retirement of his convent; and discipline was hardly known there. The monks feasted sumptuously in private chambers, while the great refectory was almost abandoned. In the days of Abbot Cullyng matters became even worse. Unlawful haunches of red deer from the moors, or flagons of Bordeaux and Bacharach in the solitude of monastic cells, were bad enough; but now the monks threw off their habit altogether, and flaunted about the streets of Tavistock in secular buttoned hoods, and in boots with long pointed beaks. It was perhaps a fitting retribution that of a monastery thus secularised almost all important traces should be swept away. Yet the church remained until the end of the seventeenth century; and the circular chapter-house was destroyed almost within our own days by one Saunders, of barbarous memory; who built on its site the house which has since become the Bedford Hotel.

We have thus briefly noticed the greater religious houses

of Devonshire. All, as we have seen, were monasteries for men,—except one—the sole convent for women in the county,—the house of Augustinian canonesses at Canonsleigh. In the middle of the twelfth century there appeared in Devonshire, as elsewhere, the new orders of the Friars—Dominican, Franciscan, and Carmelite. They, as we know, established themselves in the towns, to which their coming was little short of a religious revolution. Their houses were placed in the meanest and poorest quarters, sometimes among the lepers. Their work was entirely the teaching and succouring of the poor; and it was not for some time after their first appearance that they abandoned the extreme poverty and hardness of their lives, and became such as we find them in the pages of Chaucer and of later writers—the least respected, and the least worthy of respect, of all the monastic orders. Their fall was the greater as their beginning had been the more austere. Franciscans and Carmelites had houses at Plymouth. Franciscans and Dominicans at Exeter.

At the time of the dissolution, Devonshire was thus studded with monasteries and religious houses,—some of which were of considerable importance; and all of which must have exercised an influence which it is now hardly possible to estimate at its full value. To the Cistercians, especially, Devonshire is indebted for much. Their breeds of sheep were famous; and there can be no doubt that is owing to them that extended cultivation of the apple, which has given to the county its pre-eminence in the matter of cider. The first apple orchards in Devonshire were, it is asserted, planted by the Cistercians at Buckland. Grafts were imported by them from Burgundy and northern France—perhaps after they had tried in vain to make their vines here succeed as well as those in the Citeaux country. The plan of setting a broad flat stone between the roots of the tree and the 'deads'—as the stony undersoil is called in Devonshire—so as to compel them to spread sideways, was followed at Buckland and elsewhere, just as it is described by Mr. Oldbuck in his discussion on the Abbot's apple at Monkbarns. There are trees yet standing which may have been planted before the monks were dispersed; and many a 'Priory pippin' yet exists to prove their skill in arboriculture. The keeper of the orchards—of course unheard of in the East and North of England—was a monastic officer of no small importance in Devonshire; and we find one other personage mentioned as attached to certain of these western abbeys whose office does not occur elsewhere. This is the Medarius,—whose duty it was, not

merely to see that supplies of honey duly reached the monastery, but also to superintend the making of the mead or metheglin, which was not despised, even where the wines of Burgundy and Champagne were fully appreciated. Metheglin is now almost unknown among us. But the monks thought very differently of its merits.

There was one person who, on the fall of the Devonshire monasteries, managed to secure for himself a very large share of the spoil. This was a certain Sir Thomas Dennys;—who had built a great house at Holcombe Burnell, near Exeter, and was buried in the church there, beneath a costly monument. Some unknown interest, or his real superiority as a man of business, had procured for him the management of more than half the religious houses in the county: for by the middle of the sixteenth century the abbots had become too great personages to direct their own affairs; and such agents or supervisors were everywhere in request. Sir Thomas Dennys knew well what were the lands and the buildings best worth looking after; and he obtained grants from the crown, or bought at very small prices all such as he cared to possess. We are not about to defend the famous theory of Spelman—but the fate of Sir Thomas Dennys is at least a remarkable one. Every fragment of the monastic property passed away from him and his heirs within a very few years after he had acquired it. His great house has been nearly pulled down, and the small portion which remains serves but to indicate its former importance. And although the church contains a curious monument, which also served as the Easter sepulchre, and which, from its semi-Italian details, may well belong to the first half of the sixteenth century, there is no positive evidence for connecting it with the last resting place of Sir Thomas Dennys. 'His memorial has perished with him.'

We can hardly regret the monasteries, as they were at the end. Their time had come, and nothing could have saved them. But we should be more than unjust—we should display utter ignorance of and indifference to historical truth, if we did not recognise their great services to civilisation, learning, and religion in that earlier time when perhaps no other form of Christian life could have withstood so effectually the rude fierceness of the age. And, spite of all the evil which may truly enough be laid to their account, and of all the deterioration to which a stern monastic rule seems inevitably subject, something of primitive peace and self-devotion seems yet to linger round their quiet, deserted ruins,—they still in-

spire something of the feeling which dictated the inscription to be seen above many a Cistercian portal, and which, while S. Bernard's voice was still sounding throughout the order he loved, was not untrue—

'Here man more purely lives ; less oft doth fall.'

ART. V.—FRANCE IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.

1. *Les Origines de la France Contemporaine.* Par H. TAINÉ. Tome I. 'L'Ancien Régime.' (Paris : Librairie Hachette et Cie., 1876.)
2. *Le Clergé de Quatre-vingt-neuf.* Par J. WALLON. (Paris : Charpentier et Cie., 1876.)
3. *XVIII^{me} Siècle : Institutions, Usages et Costumes. France, 1700—1789.* PAUL LACROIX (Bibliophile Jacob). Ouvrage illustré de 21 chromo-lithographies, et de 350 gravures sur bois. (Paris : Librairie de Firmin-Didot Frères, Fils et Cie., 1875.)

OF the brilliant capabilities of M. Taine for the task which he has set before himself there can be little question. The industry which has not only ransacked the public archives of his country, but dragged to light spoils to delight historian and antiquarian alike—documents that lay hidden in forgotten corners, musty parchments, yellow and mouldering chronicles of expenditure, of wrong, oppression, or generosity—is more than equalled by the skill with which his materials are sifted, and by his power of exciting interest in the driest statistics. Nay, in his hands statistics cease to be dry, and the microscopic minuteness of detail with which he threatens us rather absorbs than repels his readers.

It is, perhaps, impossible, when the history of but one century or portion of time is presented, altogether to avoid the impression of abruptness ; and undoubtedly the eighteenth century needs a close preliminary study of preceding years to explain the rigour of the feudal system in France at a time when elsewhere it had become modified. For though it has been said, truly enough, that in every age and country, until times comparatively recent, personal servitude¹ appears

¹ Hallam's *State of Europe during the Middle Ages*, chapter ii.

to have been the lot of a large, perhaps the greater, portion of mankind, yet in no other great country down to so late a period, with the probable exception of Russia, do we find such an overgrowth of privileges, or such a corresponding bondage of the unfavoured classes. Between the middle ages and the reign of the Grand Monarque, when absolute power was at its height, feudalism in France had undergone a change of a peculiar and unequal character; its oppressions remaining in full force, while the bond of mutual contract no longer exerted its beneficent influence. Here and there one of the old lion-hearted nobles still lingered, dwelling among his own people, and keenly exacting their duty, while on his side protecting them with patriarchal care. Such instances, however, were few. The reign of Louis XIV. proved fatal to the hardy race of lords which furnished them; for the King's policy led him to withdraw them from their estates and attract them to his court, until the division which more than in any other country separated the nobles from the lower classes gradually widened into a chasm.

Everything contributed to this separation. All means of power, whether of wealth or knowledge, were heaped on the privileged classes which stood on one side of the gulf. Half the kingdom was in their hands. If a man wished to rise in the world it became absolutely necessary that he should, by whatever means lay in his reach, first enter that magic circle on which the gifts of the kingdom were showered. Louis XIV. turned the monarchy into a vast court, and the aristocracy into courtiers. They enjoyed a monopoly of all that to men's eyes is pleasant; their very title, 'the privileged classes,' marking the position they occupied. The nobles wielded powers which had indeed sprung out of the feudal system, but yet had altogether changed its nature, their own obligations towards their vassals having faded from remembrance, while the dues which were to be paid to themselves were claimed to the uttermost. Was there a bridge, a road, a canal constructed?—it was burdened with heavy duties to the lord of the soil. Grain must yield so much, cattle so much, vines so much, fish so much, merchandise so much. Was a road to be made for the convenience of the master?—a *corvée* forced the peasants to leave their own work and give their strength to his. They were harnessed to carts like beasts, and were absolutely in the power of their lord. Not even permitted to inclose their lands without special leave, lest such inclosures should interfere with the free course of the hunt, which might

at any time sweep over their crops, they were, moreover, in certain districts, forbidden to enter their own fields during the months when the partridges were sitting. The misery and distress of the lower class during the eighteenth century baffle description, and, according to M. Lacroix, its three chief divisions had little to unite them, the artisan finding no link with the labourer, and both despising the servant 'whom they considered a degraded being, a deserter attached to the service of a common enemy.' Nor was this misery shut out from the ranks above them. Frequently sunk in the very extreme of poverty, there were provincial nobles hated by the poor whom they oppressed, and who yet were in a measure forced into this oppression by the necessities of life. It was not uncommon to hear of their dying of hunger, or to see them working at the lowest employments. 'High and mighty lords of a pigeon-cote, a swamp, and a warren,' it was too often only by cruel exactions of the privileges of their class from those yet more wretched than themselves, that they could eke out a scanty existence.

"Survey," says the Abbé Coyer, "these lordly lands which can no longer nourish their lords. See these farms without cattle ; these fields neglected or altogether uncultivated ; these failing harvests for which a creditor waits, writ in hand ; this château, which threatens its masters ; a family as destitute of education as of clothes ; a father and mother only united by their tears. Where is the use of these marks of honour which indigence degrades ; of these coats of arms eaten out by time ; of this grand pew in the parish church, to which it were better they hung a poor-box for the benefit of its lord ; of these nominal prayers which the curé, if he dared, would change into a recommendation to the charity of the faithful? . . . this authority, which under the pressure of misfortune becomes degraded and ill-used?"¹

As for the richer nobles, with one or two splendid exceptions, they were non-resident ; that is to say, they left their estates to be farmed by stewards and intendants, and betook themselves to Versailles. 'Sire,' said M. de Vardes to Louis XIV., 'absent from your Majesty one is not only unhappy but also ridiculous ;' and the words, which only strike us as extravagant, represented the actual sentiments of his class. It was a natural consequence that the estates should suffer. The places of the real masters being filled by men who enriched themselves at the expense of both proprietors and tenants, the peasants were helpless. Did they hope to meet with justice at the hands of the numerous judges,

¹ *Lacroix*, p. 42.

solicitors, registrars, and the like, who professed to dispense it?—in them they found creatures who had received their promotion from the noble himself, who possibly had been his servants, who, at any rate, extorted a livelihood from the lawsuits they encouraged.

Thus sad, broken down, and hopeless was the condition of the people at an age marked by contrasts so strong that we might be disposed to doubt the truth of M. Taine's colouring, did he not bring a mass of contemporary evidence to its support. But it is unnecessary to add wilful tyranny to the faults of the nobles; rather it would seem as if in these years there was a continual seeking after pleasure, which would have been startled and offended by the realisation of pain. It was Dives, not indeed driving Lazarus from his gate, but leaving him to the consolation of the crumbs and the dogs. The charities of the day were magnificent. We have only to turn to the pages of Molière to find the peasant in the gala dress in which fashion delighted to clothe him—theoretically. The country was an innocent Arcadia in which shepherds and shepherdesses twined their crooks with ribbons, and led forth their flocks to the music of a pastoral. M. Jourdain impatiently asks, '*Pourquoi toujours les bergers ? On ne voit que cela par tout ;*' and the dancing-master answers, '*Lorsqu'on a des personnes à faire parler en musique, il faut bien que pour la vraisemblance, on donne dans la bergerie.*' Watteau painted this picturesque and poetical life, and great ladies reproduced it in their *salons*; but it scarcely harmonised with the grim horrors of reality. That in the year 1715 a million persons should die of misery and hunger might be regarded as a terrible but still an abnormal visitation, were it not that the years which follow disclose so much of the same wretchedness. M. Taine forces us to consider what was the burden of the over-taxed poor. As if he feared to trust his own words, he heaps quotation upon quotation, until we are tempted to hold up our hands and cry 'enough!' St. Simon, d'Argenson, Turgot, Taillandier, Floquet, and a dozen others bring their testimony, and intend after intend witnesses to these intolerable grievances.

'The taxes are levied with more than military rigour. The collectors, accompanied by bailiffs and locksmiths, force doors, seize the goods and sell them for a quarter of their value, and the expenses exceed the tax. "At this moment," says d'Argenson, "I find myself on my estates at Touraine. I see nothing around me but a terrible distress; it is no longer the sad sensation of misery, it is despair which has seized the poor inhabitants; they only long for death.

..... It is calculated that each year a quarter of the labourers' time has to go to the *corvées*. There they have to support themselves, and on what? I see the poor people dying there of wretchedness."¹

The lands that once were fertile became barren tracts of heath and gorse; the food of the peasants for the most part consisted of oats, buckwheat, barley, rye, chestnuts, and skim-milk; rags clothed them, and their houses were at least as wretched as their food and dress. Taxation, indeed, had reached a height which it is hardly possible to exaggerate. Directly or indirectly, it fastened itself with a cruel inequality upon all the poor man touched or possessed; nay, to be without possessions altogether did not deliver him, since the capitation-tax forced him to pay for his very existence in the world.

Nor could anything have been devised more vexatious in their nature than the imposts. That upon salt, for instance, cruel enough at the best, was rendered more unendurable by the hundred restrictions and fines which clung to it; so that not only was each person above the age of seven forced, whether he would or no, to consume and pay duty upon a fixed annual quantity, but this might only be used for specified purposes; and, if a pig had to be salted or fish preserved, he must obtain an extra supply, and pay an additional duty. By the acknowledgment of a Controller-General, this *gabelle* or salt-tax led 'every year to 4,000 domiciliary restraints, to 3,400 imprisonments, and to 500 sentences to the lash, to banishment, and the galleys.'

With such facts before us, it is difficult to understand the imbecility or short-sightedness of the rulers. Slowly, but surely, these pastoral peasants, crooked and bedizened by the imagination of the *salons*, were being transformed into gaunt wolves, famine-struck, desperate, and ready to leap at the throats of those whom they had learnt to hate. Already the tide of revolt was gathering force. Beggars became vagabonds, vagabonds robbers. It is a significant fact that at Lyons, where in a few years the atrocities of the Revolution were at their height, 30,000 workmen owed their subsistence to public charity. Ignorance and credulity played their part in the prologue, and, with these actors and their situations, the coming tragedy foretold itself.

Meanwhile, what was the Church about? Why was not her voice raised on behalf of these down-trodden peasants? It is true that the great Avignon schism of the fourteenth

¹ *Taine*, p. 433.

century transferred certain of her rights to the secular French power; yet this partly was counterbalanced by the famous ecclesiastical liberties of which it became the indirect cause. The Concordat of Bologna, far more fatal in its results, did, on the other hand, seriously and permanently weaken the Gallican Church, of which Pope and King shared the spoils. And herein probably lies an answer to the question, and a background to the picture presented by M. Wallon. For outwardly, there never was a time when the Church in France had larger means of power in her possession, although, as we shall presently see, their distribution was marked by the same violent contrasts noticeable elsewhere. The truth appears to be that internally she was in a state of anarchy. The Bull of Clement XI., supported by all the power and subtlety of the Jesuits, had raised an undying opposition among the Gallican clergy and the civil parliaments, which resulted in the nominal banishment of the Jesuits in 1762. But that ambitious and unscrupulous Company, never known to accept defeat, or to hesitate at the use of means which might further their ultimate objects, did not hesitate now, with their own re-establishment in view, to foment strife, and to work without cessation at the suppression of parliaments, and the destruction of those religious orders which were hostile to the Bull. It is not necessary to follow M. Wallon to the point which he himself reaches in this matter, or to accept as authoritative his statement that the Jesuits aimed at a universal overthrow of all existing institutions; but that their conduct at this period was such as to weaken the Church, while seeking to exalt their own order, may be fairly gathered from the evidence he has collected. Already the differences between the higher and lower ranks of clergy were too strongly marked. While the prelates of the Church lived with a pomp and state falling little short of the magnificence of royalty, there were those of the poorer clergy who had scarcely the wherewithal to live at all. Few indeed were the crumbs that came to their lot. They shared the miseries of their people, often had barely food enough, and dwelt in houses hardly habitable. On the testimony of the *grand vicaire* of Châlons, we find the 'superior clergy regarding the *curés* as hired servitors, whom, in order to dominate, it is prudent to keep in poverty and ignorance.' And all which widened the separation between the two sections was mischievous, yet unfortunately resorted to for political ends.

Returning to the other classes, those who desire to have a vivid picture of the people of Paris during the eighteenth

century—of their homes, occupations, and the characteristics which made them an entirely distinct race from the provincials—cannot do better than study M. Lacroix's exhaustive volume, which he modestly calls no more than a descriptive and picturesque history. But having studied Paris—then, as now, a magnetic centre, with a strange power of assimilation at work upon all that touched it—we find a centre of centres—Versailles. The cost of the Palace alone amounted to 153 millions of francs, or 750 millions if computed by the value of to-day; and round this chief building its unwieldy magnificence stretched for miles. The very list of its officers is startling; even the canal which ran through the park had its fleet, and its service of sailors. To such a court, where multitudes of hangers-on were supported under the most nominal pretences, where not all Marie Antoinette's love of simplicity could reduce her special retinue below 496, or her month old baby's below 80—the King's exceeding 4,000—it may be conceived that no words were more hateful than those which hinted at reductions and reform. Throngs of the clergy, of doctors, lawyers, artists, professors, and attendants of all kinds, were attached to the King and Princes; while to those who officially belonged to the service may be added a number of such as were simply courtiers, whose life of carnival was made up of a round of balls—sometimes lasting for twelve hours—plays, suppers, gambling, and hunting. Picture the gaiety of the assembly, the brilliancy of the colouring, the towering head-dresses, above which waved the feathers which Marie Antoinette encouraged against the King's more sober tastes.

'It is a gigantic living bouquet, almost too dazzling for the eye to bear. Unlike the present time, there are no black coats to produce a contrast. Powdered and puffed, with curls and bows, with cravats and ruffles of lace, in coats and waistcoats of yellow brown, pale rose, or cerulean blue silk, decked with braidings and laced with gold, the men are as gaily attired as the women. Men and women, they have been chosen one by one, the most finished people of society, adorned with every grace that can be bestowed by race, education, fortune, leisure, and custom; they are perfect of their kind. There is not a toilet here, not a movement of the head, not a tone of voice, not a turn of a sentence, which is not the very *chef-d'œuvre* of polite culture, and the distilled quintessence of all social art can produce of exquisite elaboration.'¹

One of the noblest and the saddest statues in the Vatican is that of Thalia. The comic mask lies under her hand; she

¹ *Taine*, p. 133.

is looking out at the world, whose follies she represents, with a stern and reproachful face. Not the shadow of a smile is in her eyes; her mouth, touched with disdain, compresses itself into an infinite sadness. Of all epochs in the world it was surely during this whirl of dust, which preceded the storm of the Revolution, that such a face looked out from behind the hollow mask of gaiety in France.

Note also that the whirl swept away those that opposed it. Louis XVI., to whom it was constitutionally repulsive, had not the strength to extricate himself, and there was an extraordinary bondage of etiquette—M. Lacroix calls it ferocious—ranged on the same side. The word 'extravagance,' however expressive, when it is applied to these times utterly fails to support the needful burden. Reckless prodigality, waste, and fraud disclose themselves on every page of the records. What was consumed had scarcely any connexion with what was paid for. Madame Elizabeth was the most economical and unpretentious of all the princesses; yet in one year she expended 30,000 francs on fish, 70,000 on meat and game, and 60,000 on wax lights—apparently an expensive item, since they cost the Queen, for the same time, 157,109 francs. Nor were these follies confined to Versailles. There, it is true, they originated; but such of the great world as were debarred from their exercise in their most appropriate sphere, did their best to carry them out elsewhere; while those who had not yet gained the right of entry, the *parvenus* and *annoblis*, mimicked them with varying success.

We think that this latter class, and that from which they sprang, receive insufficient attention from M. Taine; it is as if the two extremities of the social scale had so filled his vision, and the violent contrasts of society so fired his imagination, that he has failed to put a middle distance into his picture. Yet between peasants and nobles the *bourgeoisie* have played by no means an unimportant part in the history of France. In the provinces, during this eighteenth century, their family lives carried out something of that beautiful ideal which France has always cherished, and at no time been without. Their homes were quiet, well conducted, and strong in the bonds of affection. They were honourable men, industrious and unassuming, homely in their occupations and pleasures. In the capital, on the contrary, and among the rich *bourgeois*, the extravagances of the nobles were repeated, and made even more conspicuous by the bad taste which brought upon them the keen scorn of those whom they parodied; the younger men indulging in all descriptions of finery, loading

themselves with scents, wearing curls, carrying workbags for their tapestry, and giving audiences in bed. The ridicule they excited added to their dislike of the nobles. Even in Paris, however, the Marquis de Bouillé says 'the *bourgeoisie* was superior in wealth, talents, and in personal merit. In provincial towns it had the same superiority over the country nobles, was aware of the superiority, yet was everywhere made to suffer humiliation, saw itself by military rules shut out from employment in the army, and in some sort from the higher ranks of the clergy.'¹

Returning somewhat on our steps, we notice how absolutely artificial was life among the French aristocracy. Everything, even folly, moved by rule. So much sympathy was permitted, nay, required, because it was amiable; but it must follow an appointed path, acknowledge its bounds, and in no case venture to transgress them. An impulse of kindness, expressed without due reference to these laws, might offend even the person who had excited it; as, for instance, when poor 'Mademoiselle de —', having obtained a pension for her dancing-master, Marcel, ran joyfully towards him and presented him with the warrant. Marcel took it and threw it on the ground. "Is it in such a manner, Mademoiselle, that I have instructed you to offer anything? Pick up the paper, and bring it to me properly." She took the warrant, and presented it to him with all the desired graces. "That is well, Mademoiselle," said Marcel; "and, although your elbow was not sufficiently rounded, I accept it, and I thank you."² Nature was repressed, emotions attenuated and fine-drawn, until not even the instinct of self-defence was permitted to assert itself. M. Taine presses home this point:—

'With death present before them, they have not that angry leaping of the blood, that swift and general gathering together of all the powers, that murderous instinct, that blind and irresistible desire to strike the one who strikes. You will never see a gentleman arrested in his home break the head of the Jacobin who arrests him. They allow themselves to be taken, they go submissively to prison; to make a disturbance would be a mark of bad taste; and, before all else, it is necessary they should continue what they are—people of good breeding. In prison, men and women dress themselves with care, pay visits, hold receptions; it may be at the end of a corridor under the light of four candles; but there they will jest, compose madrigals, repeat rhymes, and pique themselves upon being as gallant, as gay, and as gracious as ever. Should you become morose or ill-informed

¹ *Lacroix*, p. 79.

² *Ancien Régime*, p. 206.

because accident has lodged you in a poor inn? Before the judges in the condemned cart, they will preserve their dignity and their smile. The women, above all, will pass to the scaffold with the ease and serenity which they take to a *soirée*.¹

Three of M. Taine's books are thus filled with a picture of the outward aspects of the *ancien régime*; and if here and there he may seem to have left some features untouched, and some outlines unfilled, it must be acknowledged that the parts which he has chosen to present to us are finished with an elaboration and distinctness of which we cannot speak too highly. Probably his labour became most entirely a labour of love in the two remaining books, which treat of Intellect and Doctrines, and the Propagation of the Doctrines. In these philosophic fields he revels, grouping the several theories with a master's hand, while piercing their subtleties with a touch as fine and light as the antennæ of an insect. Beginning by tracing the effect of science upon the minds of men, slowly awakening to its wonders, and accepting its teaching with greater eagerness as it became more dogmatic, it is into a dissection of the classical form in which during two centuries the intellectual life of France clothed itself, that he flings himself with most enthusiasm. It is another proof of the artificial character which had become impressed upon the nation, that one, and but one, mould was acknowledged into which must needs be poured thought, imagination, history, philosophy, all that the most splendid intellects could offer. 'Il ne faut qu'un mauvais mot,' said Vaugelas, 'pour faire mépriser une personne dans une compagnie.'

'Except with La Fontaine, a genius spontaneous and isolated, who reopens the ancient springs; except with La Bruyère, a bold seeker who opens a new spring; except with Voltaire, a demon incarnate who, in his anonymous or pseudonymous writings, suffers no bridle to check the violence and crudity of his mood, apt words fell entirely into disuse. Gresset one day, in a speech at the Academy, let drop five or six—it was, I think, on some question of carriages and of hair-dressing; murmurs broke out. During his long absence he had become provincial and had lost his style. By degrees nothing came to be used in speeches but "general expressions." According to Buffon's precept, they were even employed to designate particular things.'²

Language so smoothed necessarily lost the keen edge of truth.

Nor was it only literature which became generalised and

¹ Taine, p. 219.

² *Ibid.* p. 245.

idealised ; art was governed by the same laws. In painting, nymphs, temples, and heathen mythology were everywhere introduced, and natural forms despised. The swelling clouds of that age might indeed have formed couches for the nymphs, but never could have stored the wholesome rain for the earth ; the poor trees crooked their distorted branches after a manner impossible except under the hands of classical artists. It was not permissible to individualise or to call things by their plain names ; they must be clothed in a hazy generalisation, demanding no strength of outline, awakening no contradiction, yet hedged in by the strictest laws. That which governing man's actions was called etiquette, became in its intellectual relations the classical method, and in each case bound its votaries in fetters.

M. Taine's vivid definition of this style must be given in his own words :

‘Le style classique est incapable de peindre ou d'enregistrer complètement les détails infinis et accidentés de l'expérience. Il se refuse à exprimer les dehors physiques des choses, la sensation directe du spectateur, les extrémités hautes et basses de la passion, la physionomie prodigieusement composée et absolument personnelle de l'individu vivant, bref cet ensemble unique de traits innombrables, accordés et mobiles, qui composent, non pas le caractère humain en général, mais tel caractère humain, et qu'un Saint Simon, un Balzac, un Shakspeare lui-même ne pourraient rendre, si le langage copieux qu'ils manient, et que leurs témérités enrichissent encore, ne venait prêter ses nuances aux détails multipliés de leur observation. Avec ce style on ne peut traduire ni la Bible, ni Homère, ni Dante, ni Shakspeare ; lisez le monologue d'Hamlet dans Voltaire, et voyez ce qu'il en reste, une déclamation abstraite, à peu près ce qui reste d'Othello dans son Orosmane. Regardez dans Homère, puis dans Fénelon, l'île de Calypso ; l'île rocheuse, sauvage, où nichent “les mouettes et les autres oiseaux de mer aux longues ailes,” devient dans la belle prose française un parc quelconque arrangé “pour le plaisir des yeux.”’¹

Was the artificial life of the century the cause or effect of this style ? M. Taine is inclined to regard it as the effect, and to make literature the moving power ; but it is at least as likely that it grew out of the changed conditions of French life which he makes apparent in his first book, *The Structure of Society*. For more and more among the aristocracy those conditions became inclosed between narrowest bounds, and people refused to look out from thence at the realities of life, since realities frequently meant miseries, and almost always disagreeables. No more was permitted to enter than should

¹ Taine, p. 250.

produce a gentle titillation of sentiment, amiable as befitted the polish of society, and broadly diffused rather than concentrated upon an object. And surely it may have been by reason of this abstraction, and by dint of contemplating human nature only in its most artificial form, that, whether in literature, arts, or the drama, man became stiffened into an automaton, moving, speaking, and thinking like the creature of philosophic saloons. Other countries had not thus lost vitality. M. Taine frankly admits that in England fiction was true to contemporary life; that in the pages of Richardson, Defoe, Fielding, Smollett, Sterne, and Goldsmith, down to Miss Burney and Miss Austen, we know what the England of the eighteenth century resembled, and from their life-like presentments can form a vivid conception of a 'vanished world.' But out of French romances no such assistance arises for the historian, details are omitted, 'je vois des politesses, des gentillesse, des galanteries, des polissonneries, des dissertations de société, et puis c'est tout.' It is true. It is not that descriptions are wanting. Madame de Genlis is wearisomely minute, and even makes some attempt at characterisation; but the pages repeat themselves one after another like the ticking of a clock, until we are lost in the polite maze M. Taine reprobates.

To the different systems of philosophy he devotes several exhaustive chapters; and clothed as they are in language so brilliant and attractive as to ensure popularity, they are admirably calculated to enlarge the vague ideas which people in general are content to accept upon the subject, concentrating all philosophy upon Rousseau, all infidelity upon Voltaire, and ignoring both the specific teaching of these two and the very existence of other schools. Many forces combined at this time to drive men's thoughts out of their ancient channels. Religion had received a succession of severe shocks. Instead of the clergy resisting the corruption of the age, they offered but too flagrant instances of its shamelessness. The episcopal palaces were surpassed by none in the extravagance of their pomp. The Cardinal Bishop de Rohan, in his palace at Saverne, had no fewer than 700 beds, 14 *maîtres-d'hôtel*, 25 *valets-de-chambre*, and 100 horses. The bishops indeed lived as princes: 'they have clients, guests, a *lever*, an antechamber, ushers, officers;' everything which belonged to a great lord up to the finishing point—his debts:

'There was an open traffic in benefices; the episcopate was

nothing but a secular dignity. It was necessary to be count or marquis in order to become a successor of the Apostles, unless some extraordinary event snatched some little bishopric for a *parvenu* from the hands of the Minister. "Deplorable abuses," continues the Abbé Guillon, "which deceived the National Assembly, and prevented its distinguishing between the holiness of the episcopate and the private conduct of bishops." Abuses the more fatal, let us add, that they accustomed the bishops to squander the revenues of their provinces at the court; and that having created two ranks of clergy in the Church, the high and the low, of necessity hostile to each other, they presented the scandal of lordly prelates living in the most refined luxury by the side of a *small* clergy dying of hunger, of whom the emolument, reduced by the rapacity of their masters, had received the sad and significant name of the *suitable portion*.¹

After hearing of bishops hunting, fighting duels, and acting in broad comedies; after seeing the highest offices of the Church in the hands of such shameless and openly immoral men as Brienne, Dubois, Dillon, or Montmorency; after finding the Ultramontane M. Lacroix, the Gallican M. Wallon, and the author of the *Ancien Régime*—certainly neither Ultramontane nor Gallican—agreeing in the broad features of their testimony, there is a relief in turning to the thought of such bishops as M. de Belzunce, M. de Beauvais, the learned De Luynes, the upright De Beaumont, and of that great body of admirable *curés*, who, living hidden lives, were not set in the front of the world's regard, but who extracted for their Church these memorable words of De Tocqueville:

'Taken altogether, and notwithstanding the glaring vices of some of its members, I do not know whether the world has ever had a clergy more memorable than the Catholic clergy of France at the moment when surprised by the Revolution; more enlightened, more national, less entrenched within private virtues only, better provided with public virtues, and at the same time with more of faith. I began the study of ancient society full of prejudices against them, I finished it full of respect.'²

Yet this very distinction points to the same contrast which elsewhere had so mischievous an effect. A sharp line was laid down between the clergy of the first order and the second. The first belonged to the *noblesse*—they were privileged, the richest emoluments were heaped upon them without any recommendation being required except that of birth; the second was drawn from the *bourgeoisie* and the people, and these were naturally irritated by a monopoly so unjust. There was a further cause of discontent. Enormous

¹ Wallon, p. 61.

² *Ibid.* p. 65.

revenues were held by the Church ; it was said that a third part of the possessions of the kingdom was in the hands of the clergy ; yet, at a time when the people groaned under a crushing weight of taxation, these possessions contributed nothing. Out of twenty-six millions of men in France, eight millions were exempt. When at last the treasuries ran dry and the Ministers of Finance were at their wits' end, they made constant efforts to extract contributions from the ecclesiastical estates ; but the clergy would consent to no more than voluntary gifts, and the conflict, which lasted many years, and with increasing energy, drew the attention of the people and embittered their hostility.

Taking, then, into account this weakening of religious influence, add to the other side the strength of the impulse which springs from reaction. Hitherto the supreme control of man's spiritual life had exclusively belonged, we will not say to faith, but to tradition, reason having been altogether and unfairly subordinated : the pressure removed, the usual rush to an opposite extreme followed. It was inevitable ; yet to those who shared in it it seemed nothing less than a revelation, or short of the whole truth. It swept away its boundaries, arrogated supreme sovereignty, and pronounced difference of opinion to be revolt ; and M. Taine is at pains to point out how by this tyrannical despotism the 'age of reason' erred against the fundamental laws of true philosophy. His own creed, it is true—if indeed it be contained in the chapter which deals with the philosophy of the eighteenth century—is of a gentler and more alluring nature ; and there is a subtler attraction in the breadth which admits freely and universally the need of *a*, though it would not require *the*, faith. He goes so far as to recognise in what he styles 'hereditary prejudices' something which is indispensable to the good of society ; in religion something of which certain men have gained a perception under the influence of their most sublime emotions, and which their lofty enthusiasm has communicated almost electrically to the multitudes beneath them. Christianity or Brahminism, Mohammedism or Buddhism, each by a natural development grows into existence as it is wanted, and each is happily and fortuitously fitted to its geographical position. As we float onwards upon this placid stream into the dim mist where we are to satisfy ourselves with catching at what phantoms we can, since they are but shadows for our amusement, and absolute truth there is none, we begin to marvel whether the classical spirit does not still pursue us with its vague generalities, extracting life, reality,

and sincerity from man's soul ; and M. Taine must pardon us if we apply the words 'sentimental fog,' with which he describes its effect upon men and things, to his own philosophic estimate of the religions of the world.

Returning, however, to the history of French philosophy, we find in the *Ancien Régime* an admirable review of its advances and success. Voltaire and Montesquieu gave the first thrust against tradition by making tradition ridiculous—in the eyes of a Frenchman an unpardonable fault. Heaping together the contradictory systems of different nations, and laying bare their weak points with ruthless scorn, they brought contempt upon one institution after another, the Church especially receiving Voltaire's most violent onslaughts. This man, with his passionate, excitable nature, his cynic wit, his *bourgeois* birth, and aristocratic tendencies, seemed to gather into his own person all the particles of revolt with which the air was charged. He was impatient of whatever he could not epitomise into 'petites phrases portatives ;' it was he who wondered that people could be found to admire 'feats of imagination as stupidly extravagant and barbarous' as those of the *Divina Commedia*. He did not deny the existence of God—'il est bigot, c'est un déiste,' said a scorner—but he flung himself with all his might against whatever is included in the revelation of God. Naturally those to whom he had opened the way did not pause where he stopped. The Encyclopædists, taking up his doctrines, pushed them to their farthest extremity. Diderot, while indulging an amiable admiration for benevolence and generosity, inculcates tenets which set all morality at naught, M. Taine comparing him to a 'volcano in eruption, which during forty years emits ideas of all kinds and sorts, mingled and seething—precious metals, coarse dross, fetid mud.' His followers enlarge upon his irreconcilable maxims. Personal interest is to be accepted as sole guide. All our relations to others need be governed by nothing higher than the gratification of our own selfishness. With cries against God, against law, and against order, these men roused passions which were not slow to work out their theories to their inevitable conclusions.

The Encyclopædists having thus stirred human nature by a cynical and revolting appeal to its selfishness, Rousseau's doctrine had the effect of touching a higher chord, and bringing to bear an apparently nobler influence. It was infinitely more specious and attractive, and enjoyed a far more universal acceptance among all classes. He himself was a man of most unusual character : his moral life repulsive ; his

sentimentality morbid ; his self-love, as M. Taine remarks, so intense that, even when he is conscious of deserved blame, he cannot blame himself, and his self-entrancement so complete that in himself he sees a type of the whole world. His doctrine grew out of this strange idolisation of self ; strange because, from one cause or another, it is seldom permitted to attain to such a height. He taught the natural perfectibility of man, who, being left to his own instincts and guided by conscience, which he calls the voice of the soul, must needs rise to his proper station in the universe. And such a doctrine, bringing, as it did, a sort of authority for the destruction of whatever in the eyes of its disciples hindered the development of humanity, made it tenfold more potent than the rival systems. It claimed actual right on its side. Moreover, although the world into which Rousseau conducts us seems hardly less artificial than that against which he protests, we can scarcely be fair judges in this matter ; and it at least adopted the name of nature, and appealed to the jaded frequenters of the *salons* ; while, if his benevolence now appears to evaporate in sentiment, there was something excessively attractive then in the advocacy of humanity. Here, however, we are inclined to think that M. Taine credits Rousseau too readily with being the first to claim its rights, Fénelon having already taught and preached them in a palace.

Thus, then, we have the most important of the new systems. Thus we see, rising before us, man's image after the philosophic ideal—reasonable, free, equal, happy, self-contained, self-content, each fulfilling his mission, each fitting into the niche provided for him. Strange delusion ! So strange and else so inexplicable that we are compelled to acknowledge the justice of M. Taine's charge against the classical spirit as one at least of the blind guides which had drawn the keenest intellects of the century into this curiously childish estimate of man. They believed that everywhere, in whatever condition, whether 'uneducated villager, tattooed barbarian, naked savage,' man had in himself 'the power of explanation, of reasoning, of following attentively and intelligently an abstract discourse—that, in fact, reason was all-powerful, and, which is even more wonderful, omnipresent. They hugged the vague Arcadian ideas which had so long been rife in the *salons* ; only that now, instead of wreathing crooks with ribbons, they taught their shepherds to babble philosophy. Otherwise they remained the same ; gentle, reasonable, amenable, docile—this people who were already yelling for bread, and fast changing

into tyrants. M. Taine accepts this artificial soil as an explanation of the fact that, while Rousseau's theories took root and flourished in France, they failed to impress themselves upon other nations, educated in a larger knowledge of mankind—England, for instance, from whence Rousseau originally derived them—where they never approached the extraordinary development which they received in France.

But philosophy, although it aspired to revolutionise a world, did not entrench itself behind the gravity we are apt to connect with its name. It was lively, witty, sociable. Rousseau, it is true, hated society and complained of its *salons*; but the other leaders of thought sunned themselves in its smiles, and, instead of banishing philosophy in the presence of the great ladies of fashion, prided themselves on discoursing upon it in language so clear, so trenchant, and so free from scientific formulas, that it was no longer out of place, but rather irresistibly attracted both men and women into its brilliant centre. The *salons* became the very head-quarters of the new principles; and even Rousseau acknowledges that 'an article of ethics would not be better argued in a philosophical society than in that of some pretty Parisian;' while M. Taine impresses on his readers that 'in this century women reigned: they formed fashions, gave the tone, and, by leading conversation, led not only ideas, but opinions as well. When we find them to the fore on political ground, we may be certain the men will follow, for each draws after her her own *salon*.' To tell the truth, in these *salons* novelty was hailed as the best boon. Many occupations had there seen their rise and fall. At one time men and women alike devoted themselves to tapestry work; at another charades, riddles, or proverbs reigned, sometimes the vapours. The advent of philosophy opened a field of new ideas, at which the more cultivated, despising the light gossip about 'freemasonry, magnetism, balloons, races, theatres, and passing amusements,' eagerly caught. With women for their listeners we perceive something of the cause which gave to the language of the propounders of the doctrines its point, its clearness, concentration, and—since we must borrow from itself to express the delicacy of its qualities—its keen and exquisite *finesse*. M. Taine cannot refrain from an undisguised pride at those epigrammatic triumphs which compressed a volume of thought into a few words. They possessed an intoxication which to the world of Paris was irresistible. So long as the language was witty, no subject was too divine for its daring touch.

We may, it is true, marvel that, in the interests of their own order, the nobles should have consented to encourage, as freely as they did, the attack of freethinkers upon institutions with which they were certainly the most intimately connected. But with the greater number it is improbable that they were sufficiently conversant either with history or with man to realise the logical sequence of the movement. Each man in the satire saw the lash applied to his neighbour's follies, and derived a good deal of amusement from the operation. For himself even, he might be content to give up some, of which he was tired. They were grateful for the piquancy of novelty. There was abroad a certain revulsion of disgust against the social fetters of the age; one may notice it in the *Memoirs of Chateaubriand*. Voltaire's mockery amused them, and, if he lavished it upon the upper classes, he despised the lower, as they did. Rousseau, again, had the merit of stirring emotions until his hearers believed themselves virtuous when they were only sentimental; and, as the trumpet of every philosopher was sounded in praise of intellect, the consequence was that intellect became really a necessity of fashionable life, a part of its furniture which must be had at any price; so that, to attract it, they extended favour—which, beginning by being patronising, ended in homage—to the rising crowd of young men of the middle class, to which Voltaire, Diderot, Rousseau belonged. As we have said, though now and then they may have talked of a revolution, they intended no more than a social reform which might raise others and could not lower themselves. All the world was to move upwards. Of real politics they were, to all practical purposes, ignorant. Unlike English gentlemen who talked of them, worked at them, and shared, each in his degree, the labours and responsibilities of the Government, the French left all that to the charge of a small party in the State, contenting themselves with making them a ground for *bons mots* in their *salons*. Horace Walpole wrote that Paris society occupied itself in overturning God and the king. Moreover, with man in his natural state, the paragon which Rousseau drew for them, harmonising as he did with their idyllic shepherds and shepherdesses, what fear of evil in encouraging his free development, and untrammelling him from the restraints of loyalty and religion!

Thus the new doctrines reigned—by force of the wit which clothed them, of the corruption of what should have withstood them, of the prevalent ignorance of human nature—in the *salons* of the capital. Once there, we have little difficulty

in further admitting the likelihood of their supremacy in the class from which their leaders sprang, the class which, above all others, was in revolt. And from thence they oozed downwards by many channels, 'by malicious little rhymes, epigrams, and songs, which every morning are the novelty of the day; by shows at the fair, and harangues at the Academy; by tragedies and operas from the beginning to the end of the century, from the *Œdipus* of Voltaire to the *Tarare* of Beaumarchais.'

¹

We have said that the *bourgeoisie* was in revolt; and M. Taine offers a very probable solution of the cause which led first to its taking an interest in State affairs, and secondly to its indignation at the course of these affairs. While the country *bourgeois* lived a quiet and unostentatious life in the provinces, his town brethren plunged largely into those enormous speculations of the day in which colossal fortunes were speedily gained and lost. It is hardly possible to describe the delirious excitement of the time:—

'Montesquieu, impassible witness of these strange social metamorphoses, wrote before the catastrophe which he had foreseen: "Those who six months ago were rich are now in poverty, and those who then had not bread to eat are overflowing with riches. Never did these two extremes so nearly touch each other. The foreigner (Law) has turned the State as an old-clothesman would turn a coat; what was under he puts above, and what was above he turns inside out. What unhopèd-for fortunes, incredible even to those who have made them! . . . How many valets served to-day by their comrades, and to-morrow, perhaps, by their masters!"'

²

Fortunes flying in this fashion, hand over hand, excited a fury of speculation. The Government, on its part, contracted debts which in the space of ten years, during the reign of Louis XVI., amounted to 1,630 millions; the *bourgeoisie* became the creditors of the Government; and, as nothing excites a livelier interest in men's minds than the financial position of their debtors, their anger at the mismanagement and extravagance of the Ministers rose to a white heat. France was harassed by wars, her commerce seriously crippled by the English, her colonies wrenched from her, and those whose pockets suffered openly inveighed against the incapacity of the governing powers. Money working in this direction, education also led towards it by its imperfection and want of balance; for on one side it quickened the intellects of the young *bourgeois*, and, attracting many of them towards literature, led them to assume a superiority to the nobles, and

¹ *Ancien Régime*, p. 358.

² *Lacroix*, p. 202.

to chafe yet more at the privileges from which they saw themselves shut out; on the other, the deficiencies of education, especially manifest in an extraordinary ignorance of history, joined to the vague generalisation of which we have spoken, produced a distortion of ideas which found vent in high-sounding rhetoric:—

‘Thus,’ says M. Taine, ‘does the philosophy of the eighteenth century descend and propagate itself. On the first floor of the house, in its beautifully gilded apartments, the new ideas were no more than the illuminations of an evening—*salon* squibs, amusing Bengal fires; they played with them, they flung them with laughter from their windows. Gathered into the *entresol* and the *rez-de-chaussée*, carried into shops, magazines, and business places, they found combustible materials, long accumulated piles of wood; and behold, what great fires are kindled! It would even seem like the beginning of a conflagration; for the chimneys roar, and a red glare breaks out through the glass. “No,” say the dwellers above; “they will be careful not to set fire to the house, for they inhabit it as well as ourselves. These are only fires of straw—at most fires in the chimney; a bucket of cold water will be sufficient to extinguish them: added to which, such little accidents cleanse the chimneys by bringing down the old soot.”

‘Beware! in the cellars of the house, beneath the vast and deep vaults which support it, is stored a magazine of powder.’¹

The last ten years of the century to which these latter words point are left untouched by M. Taine; that period is to occupy the second part of his work. Besides the subjects to which we have specially alluded, curious readers will find in M. Lacroix’s volume an accumulation of facts relating to education, trade, parliaments, professions, charities, costumes, cookery, the aspect of Paris, and a dozen other matters, made the more clear to us by a number of old engravings. Each author looks at the advancing Revolution from his own point of view. M. Wallon, the Gallican, sees the handiwork of the Jesuits and Ultramontane rigidity; M. Lacroix, the Ultramontane, casts an eye of suspicion at the Jansenists; M. Taine, the philosopher, beholds the struggles of philosophy to emancipate reason from thralldom; yet, from this very divergence, the three volumes largely contribute to the right understanding of a time full not only of interest but of warning. Out of the three it is hardly necessary to say that M. Taine attracts and charms us the most. If his book is not the work of a profound thinker, it is delightful reading, so vigorous are its similes, so clear its language, so admirable its style. Only,

¹ *Ancien Régime*, p. 427.

as we read, we feel emphatically, what it has little intention of conveying, that it was the loss of Faith which led up to the Reign of Terror, and that this loss of Faith was largely caused by corruptions and crying scandals in the Church. It was not so much the comparative absence of the classical spirit in England, as the presence of a sturdy belief, which checked the doctrines of the Encyclopædists in their development. How it was that this belief kept its hold, in spite of so much that was chilling, is a larger question than can be entered upon here. At any rate our people at this time ran no danger of having it beaten out of them by unjust oppression ; and there it was, ready to meet the flood.

ART. VI.—PAROCHIAL MISSIONS.

1. *Manuel du Missionnaire*, par le P. ADRIEN NAMPON, de la Compagnie de Jésus. Troisième Edition, revue, corrigée et augmentée. (Lyon : Girard et Josserand.)
2. *Parochial Missions*. Edited by the Mission Priests of S. John the Evangelist. The Evangelist Library. (J. T. Hayes.)
3. *Parochial Missions*. By Rev. A. W. THOROLD. (Isbister.)

IN any review of the present condition of the Church of England, it is impossible not to be struck with one remarkable phenomenon. No one can be blind to the evidences which exist on every side of spiritual forces at work amongst us, such as have not made themselves felt for many generations. However absorbingly questions of ritual seem to occupy the public mind ; however terribly the thickening battle with scepticism and unbelief begins to shake the very ground we stand upon ; however impenetrable appears to be the dense mass of stolid indifference to religion which presents itself in our more crowded centres of population ; there stands out side by side with these the phenomenon of a revived earnestness of spiritual life and effort, which makes the present state of religion in this land a curiously complex and entangled problem. The truth is, thought is working in all directions : nothing is allowed to lie passive and undisturbed : and since, happily for us, we are not a people content to dream and speculate, but, being a very practical people, are possessed

with a strong conviction that theories are meant to be acted upon, it is not only thought, but also energy of action, which is pushing simultaneously in all manner of directions.

It appears to us that, whether we sadly regard the wretched bitterness engendered by ritual disputes; or watch with sinking of heart the cold creeping shadow of unbelief stealing across the land; or gaze wonderingly at the fierce and aggressive secularism which makes so many of our population worse than heathen; it is full of hope and comfort to witness, side by side with all this, an uprising of spiritual life, which must at the least in some measure counteract each of these prominent evils. Whatever be our judgment of this phenomenon in itself, it is surely not to be undervalued as a power ranged in opposition to the frivolity, the materialism, or the indifference of the age.

The Parochial Mission is just at present an agency accepted by all parties in the Church, excepting perhaps what is popularly known as the Broad party, whose position in regard to the movement was well represented by Mr. Llewellyn Davies at the time of the last London Mission in 1874. The High, the Low, and the Moderate have worked, if not upon exactly the same lines, yet in perfect accord in the matter, only vying with each other in their earnest efforts to make the Mission a reality. We do not mean that the Parochial Mission is the sole conspicuous evidence of the spiritual energy at work among us. No doubt the frequent Retreats held for the clergy, the observance, with devotional exercises and earnest addresses, of at least a single Ember day, where no more can be done,—these are no less unmistakable signs of the same strong tide of spiritual force occupying all places in our system where it can find room to penetrate. But the Parochial Mission is the form in which this movement manifests itself most clearly to the public mind. So it is our purpose to discuss this agency, both as regards its nature and principles, and also as regards its practical development.

Plainly, the mention of Parochial Missions opens up at once great questions as to the due place and sphere of the emotions in religion. Are the feelings to be enlisted at all in the service of God, or to be regarded as so fallible and treacherous that the practical Christian will seek stoically to suppress them, or at least will regard his obedience to God's Commandments as then only satisfactory when founded upon principle and not resting upon emotion? Or, if it be obvious that the feelings are meant to be in some measure enlisted,

and are to exercise a certain influence on the life and actions, in what degree is this to be? How far is it lawful or wise to make systematic efforts to arouse the more powerful but variable emotions in the cause of religion? And what limits and safeguards ought to be applied in order to prevent abuses? All these are difficult questions to answer at once, because they do not admit of a simple answer, whether affirmative or negative, but concern matters of degree, submitting themselves not so much to decisions of logical exactness as to those of wisdom and common sense, and above all of actual experience.

Now we can quite foresee what a good many will be tempted to exclaim, if ever they read the last paragraph:—‘Defend us from all this calculation and caution! What! Are these poor souls all around us to go on straight to everlasting destruction, while you are weighing and balancing and doling out your *à priori* speculations, as if there were no such tremendous realities as sin, and death, and hell? For God’s sake do anything, dare anything, risk anything, if only you can shake men out of their apathy, or frighten them out of their sins. We are too bad to be fastidious about the remedies. When our children are dying we don’t discuss the question of daily diet. We ask, Is there anything else in the world that might save them?’ Nothing is more natural than that such should be the feelings and language of many. When a clergyman, for instance, looks on his parish in some large town, and beholds a festering mass of corruption, vile pollutions of sin infecting the souls of his people as pestilential air affects their bodies, the canker of unbelief everywhere eating its way into all classes, simple irreligion vying, in its passive force of resistance to all his efforts, with the strength of positive evil,—when he sees all this, and more, he may well be judged leniently if he impatiently resents the seeming callousness of abstract speculation, and sees nothing but the necessity for vigorous action. Yet unless practical experiment be gauged and tested, as well as regulated and restricted, by wisely thought-out principles, it will assuredly be full of ultimate peril. Whatever the immediate results be, or seem to be, no system can in the long run prosper which violates the great primary laws of our being, or runs counter to the dogmatic declarations of revealed truth, or is in discord with the spirit and character of that religious organisation into which it is intruded.

That religious emotion is intended to be used, we take for granted. It is certain that no power, no faculty of the soul, was given in vain. Each has its proper use and end, its

proper exercise, its proper degree, and its proper relation to other powers and faculties. It must be so with religious emotion. It cannot be given only to be repressed and restrained. Observe, we are not dealing with a thing which is only a phenomenon of missions and revivals. Times of religious emotion come to many persons in many ways. Deep stirrings of heart and conscience are often due to events of our own lives in which others have no part. One is thus roused to unwonted religious emotion by a dangerous sickness; another by a stroke of bereavement; a third by a merciful escape from great peril; a fourth by the stirring words of some book. There are a hundred ways. Now what is to be said of these occasional times of excited religious feeling? First, no doubt, that no man must mistake religious feeling for religion. But, after that, what? That all such excited feelings are false and hollow and perilous, and must therefore be at once repressed? Surely no. Surely the true thing to be said is this, that these periods of stronger feeling are given as a help to our weak and wavering courage, that they are a spur to the halting obedience, and a goad to the reluctant will. True, they must be guarded and regulated and led into practical channels, else of course they will run to waste, and leave behind them only the barrenness of a field over which a flood has rushed headlong in its devastating course. But we are not speaking of ungoverned and fanatical excitement, but of deep and powerful religious emotion, when we say, in the words of one whose keen intellect and dread of exaggeration were ample securities against any undue leaning towards the emotional side of religion—These earnest, ardent feelings are granted us 'to take away from the *beginnings* of obedience its *grievousness*, to give us an impulse which may carry us over the first obstacles, and send us on our way rejoicing.'¹ This, at least, it is hard to doubt. The most grudging acceptance of the usefulness of religious emotion will allow that at certain times it may carry us by its force over the earlier difficulties of a new and converted life, or nerve us to resolutions and set us upon courses of action which would probably be impossible to the calculating calmness of dispassionate reason. A wise man will know very well that strong emotion is in its very nature transitory,—as a rule perhaps transitory in proportion to its strength; and that the higher, deeper, keener

¹ From J. H. Newman's well-known Sermon on the *Religious Use of Excited Feelings*, which, together with that upon *Religious Emotion*, will well repay repeated study.

feelings of a season of exceptional emotion cannot last. But that is no reason why he may not gather up the truths and the duties which they have brought to him, as we gather up the bright shells and pebbles on the seashore when a spring-tide has ebbed. These will be kept, when the surging waves which bore them to our feet have retired. The swelling of the emotions is like the overflow of a river. The sun of God's grace has melted the snows of the chill heart. But we no more expect the flow of the religious feelings to maintain the fulness and force to which it may have at times arisen than we expect a river to be always at the flood. Let us once realise that these more vivid religious emotions are occasional helps and not permanent states; that they reveal to us what might be but for the weakness and earthiness of our nature, but are in themselves no proofs of high attainments of grace; and then we may use them safely, and thank God for them.

The whole question of the religious use of the emotions is full of interest, and a most pregnant subject of thought. Probably we might be disposed to go beyond the carefully adjusted limits laid down by the great thinker already quoted, and to assign to the emotions a more prominent place in the Christian's ordinary religious life than he would have allowed. At any rate our religion is not one of mere dry duty. The very fact that *love* is so important an element in religion is a standing evidence of the impossibility of ignoring the domain of the feelings. Nor can we shut our eyes to the fact that a careful study of Holy Scripture will lead to the conviction that a greater amount of religious emotion is expected to find place in the daily life of Christians than is commonly felt, or commonly supposed needful. S. Paul was a most thoroughly practical man, eminently a man of action, always up and doing. He was surely one who would scorn to let feeling take the place of obedience, or to suffer the simple daily duties of life to escape under the cloak of heavenly aspirations and high-flown sentiment. Yet, if anything is plain in his Epistles, it is that a life of duty, however rigid and self-sacrificing, without love, joy, peace—a life of obedience without emotion—would utterly fail to satisfy him. The heart, no less than the head and the will, must be enlisted in the service of God. He hates even lukewarmness. We want our religion to be lifted up into a brighter, sunnier, calmer atmosphere. We may not acquiesce in a state of dull slavish obedience. We are not slaves but sons, and we ought to realise the 'glorious liberty of the children of God.' Our religious life then only approaches completion

when it becomes a flowing fountain of light and joy to the inmost soul.

We have been attempting to anticipate the objection that a Parochial Mission of necessity entails more or less of excitement. It does so; but there is a right use even of excitement, and excitement need not be either excessive or fruitless. Excitement is but another word for the stirring of the emotions, and we imagine the emotions require stirring in a good many. That there are some too easily stirred, too ready to be swayed and agitated by passing emotions, too excitable for a Mission to be wholesome for them, no one would care to deny. But this does not affect the truth that in the majority of persons the emotional side of their nature wants arousing to greater activity, and in a large number is very inadequately developed so far as regards the religious life.

We have spoken so far almost as if the work of a Parochial Mission were entirely occupied with the feelings, and this because it is obvious that opponents to the system find on this side the most assailable ground. But it is very far from the case that the stirring of the feelings is the sole, or even the main, characteristic of Mission work. Instruction in doctrine is always at the least one aim of the Mission preacher, and much of the teaching given during the season of the Mission is of the very quietest and most unexciting character. In Roman Catholic Missions careful instruction in Church doctrine is made a very prominent feature, and in those of the Church of England there is very little resemblance to the wild unchastened excitement which was the distinguishing mark of the Revival movements of former times, whether those of Wesley and Whitefield, or those of Dissenting or American origin. Whatever the origin of Parochial Missions, whether they are to be traced directly to the full and careful organisation of the Mission in the Church of Rome, or whether, as some suppose, they can in this land claim an independent source, and are derived from the Revivalist efforts of our Dissenting friends, with whose peculiar character and modes of action they have certain obvious affinities, still the Church of England has her own distinct tone and character, and she possesses vital energy sufficient to assimilate what she admits from any extraneous source, and to make it a part of, and conformable to, her own independent system. Blending as she does, at least in our days, a singular sobriety of doctrine and of temperament with much of the warmth and beauty of an æsthetic ritual, she is

able, and it is her privilege, to adopt and make use of the best features she can recognise on either side, and if she does not on the one hand scorn the employment of a tempered and chastened excitement, so on the other hand she does not neglect the opportunity which the Parochial Mission affords for quite simple, and yet very definite, teaching, whether upon matters of Church doctrine, or upon matters of moral obligation.

The Roman Catholic Church has an immense advantage over us in possessing a distinct order of men trained for Mission work, and devoting themselves to it. It is obviously very unsatisfactory to have to depend mainly, as we have, upon Parochial Clergy, already for the most part amply occupied, for this additional and exhausting labour. All honour to those who have made the venture, and have founded among us communities of men for this very work. But what are they among so many? Until much more extensive provision for Mission work is made, and that not by one school of Church thought alone, we shall always have to struggle with very serious difficulties. We cannot but express our deep regret that, owing to causes of which we do not know the details, the scheme by which a large college of Mission priests might have been established in South London as a memorial to the great Bishop Wilberforce, who so wisely encouraged and lovingly fostered the movement, has reached at present such moderate proportions. If only we had been able to found a Society, having the same relation to our own Church as that of S. Vincent de Paul to the Church of Rome, how many of the Parochial Clergy, who are now quite unable to withstand the urgency with which they are pressed to conduct Missions, would have been spared this laborious interruption to their home work, and have themselves instead thankfully invited the trained Mission preacher to their aid in grappling with the ignorance, vices, and indifference of their people. The organisation of Mission work in the Church of Rome is very complete. It is not only based upon authority from the first, the Missioners being duly commissioned by the Pope, the Bishop of the diocese, and the Curé of the parish, but also the Mission being recognised as an ordinary, and even necessary, instrumentality in the work of the Church. Indeed, Roman Catholic writers, such as Alphonso di Liguori, do not hesitate to speak of Missions as the one great engine for the conversion of sinners, the moral elevation of the people, and the spread of the true faith; while some even assert that all real

conversions may be traced to Missions, in comparison with which the ordinary work of the Parish Priest is barren of great results. This is obvious exaggeration ; but it is curious to notice how in this, as in so many other instances, extremes meet, and how naturally we should look for a like over-estimate of the fruits of these somewhat spasmodic efforts from a very different quarter. Missions in the Roman Church are ordinarily much longer than with us, extending over two or even three weeks. Indeed, the rules and regulations under which the Mission Priest works contemplate three full weeks, and provide subjects of instruction for that period, but in practice the programme is frequently somewhat curtailed. It is very probable that there is practical wisdom in thus extending the time of the Mission, and that the work is both more completely done and more lasting than when it is compressed within eight or nine days, but not only would it be impossible to obtain Missioners with us to undertake so lengthened a work, but also our national habits of rapid action and busy occupation would probably be impatient of the prolongation. In mentioning the concurrence of the Curé as an element in foreign Missions, as of course it is with us, we must not forget that there is another side to the picture, and that, in a Church where there is so much less independence of will and action among the clergy, and where it would be so difficult to refuse a Mission recommended by the Bishop, there are sure to be cases in which the Missioner is a somewhat unwelcome intruder, and in which his work is not wholly in harmony with the ordinary pastoral work which it professes to supplement. A telling picture of this want of harmony is given in the well-known story of the *broad church* priest and his sufferings, 'Le Maudit,' or, in the English translation, '*Under the Ban.*' Of course in Roman Catholic Missions a large part of the work consists in hearing confessions, and we shall have to speak of this presently in connexion with our own Church.

Of the minute details of Mission work it is not our purpose to speak. They will be found amply described in the works the titles of which are placed at the head of this article. The two small English books, written from wholly different points of view, will give the general reader, who has never been present at a Mission, a fair idea of the methods used by the two opposite Church schools, while M. Nampon's more ambitious work is full of interest and of information, though dealing with the subject exclusively from a Roman Catholic point of view. We, who very much prefer noting the points

of agreement to enumerating divergencies, are greatly struck by the large amount of matter common to the three.

It would be still less suitable in a brief review like this to touch upon the very solemn matter, which to any one entering practically upon the work must stand in the forefront. Yet we would not be thought to forget that unless the whole work is pervaded and uplifted by the spirit of prayer, and unless the whole tone and intention of the work is chastened and purified by the grace won in the daily Eucharist, it will certainly lack the fulness of blessing.

We desire to say a few words upon two or three prominent points in the conduct of Parochial Missions.

And first as to the great aim of the Mission preacher. He comes to a parish, on the invitation of him who is answerable for its spiritual welfare, with an earnest desire to help as many as he can, and with a very overpowering sense of the solemnity and responsibility of the undertaking. But a parish is an aggregate of the most diverse materials. It is sure to contain (though no doubt the proportions will largely differ in different cases) good and bad, earnest and indifferent, educated and uneducated, believers and unbelievers, Church people and Dissenters. Upon which of all these shall he concentrate his efforts? Shall his aim be the conversion of the godless, or the raising of the godly to loftier conceptions of holiness? Shall he speak as to those who have accepted the great foundations of the Faith, or must he seek to lay these again in the hearts of his hearers? We answer that, hard as the path may be, impossible as it may seem, he must aim at all. It is only the same problem which meets every clergyman in his ordinary preaching and teaching. He, too, has to deal with all these classes; and, although indeed the seriousness and difficulty of the problem are intensified by the shortness of the time, and the certainty of having many hearers who neglect the ordinary teaching of the parish priest, yet, as the latter will aim his shaft at various classes and characters in his course of preaching, so must the Missioner ever remember what varied classes and characters he sees gathered before him day by day to listen to what he has to say to them. He cannot restrict himself to one aim. He must be many-sided. He needs as a first requisite a comprehensiveness of survey, and a versatility of resource which shall make each of his hearers in turn feel, 'That is meant for me.' But one consideration should be borne in mind in saying this, namely, that preaching reaches upwards far more readily than downwards; or, in other words, that

whereas appeals to the sinful and the ignorant will constantly awaken an echo in the good and the educated, the inverse is far from equally true. And this thought, coupled with the fact that large numbers of the godless and ignorant are always attracted to the Mission services, will lead a wise Missioner to address his preaching largely to these, and, while he forgets not the wants of his more advanced hearers, to keep in view, at least in his course of Mission sermons, the great, broad fundamentals of religion as the staple of his appeals and exhortations. He will be able to give the more devout people much help in the varied opportunities for instruction at other hours of the day, and he will, even in his evening sermons, say many things specially meant for them, but his primary aim in these sermons will certainly be the winning of souls for Christ.

There is another question of some importance as to the character of the distinctive Mission preaching. Ought it to follow an orderly logical course, beginning, for example, with man's corruption and the nature of sin, and working on step by step through conversion, pardon, grace, and holiness, up to peace and heaven? Or may the preacher break loose from the trammels of a systematic treatment, and simply lay before his hearers just what he feels to be most likely to persuade them to accept the terms of salvation and range themselves on the side of Christ? We think the latter is the better course. God's method with the soul of man is not always the logical method. And, while we by no means despise careful arrangement of subject, and orderly sequence of thought, we believe that it is often found best at the very beginning to set forth God's loving-kindness and readiness to forgive, founding the course of preaching upon this, rather than leading up to it. Give the sinner the light of hope, and he will then follow you as you guide him up to the realisation.

What is called the 'After-meeting' is one of the most peculiar and yet one of the most universal features of the Parochial Mission. It takes various forms and is conducted in various ways; it is held sometimes in the church, and sometimes in an adjacent school-room. In intention the after-meeting seeks to deepen and confirm the impression made by the previous Mission sermon. Some Missioners make simple, homely, and pointed instruction its chief feature, others prayer, all introducing some hymns. As we said, we are not concerned with the minuter details of such a service, but the fact that extempore prayer is very generally employed, at least to some extent, in the after-meeting, demands the attention of

those who are interested in the phenomena which emerge from time to time to break the somewhat staid monotony of our ordinary Church proprieties. When the after-meeting is held in a school-room, of course everything may be left freely to the taste and discretion of the conductor. But it is the prevailing opinion that it is the better way for the congregation to remain in the church, both to avoid the risk of dispersion, and to secure greater reverence and solemnity. This at once raises a question as to the legality of such unusual methods of procedure as are adopted on these occasions. And we admit that it would be very hard to defend their legality. With the Bishop's sanction any service compiled from the Bible and Prayer-Book can be used in addition to the regular services of the Church, but this after-meeting makes no pretence to be anything of the sort. No Bishop has the power to sanction it. The only possible defence is to be found in the exceptional and temporary necessity of the case, and the absolute acquiescence of all in its innocence. We have heard it compared to a choir-practice, to which, however irregular when viewed in relation to the Act of Uniformity, no one would think of objecting. We cannot say much for such an argument, but the exceptional character of the service is at least a palliation of its irregularity, and we regard the matter as instructive with a view to the ultimate needs of the Church. Here, at least, is a violent and patent snapping of the iron bands of the Act of Uniformity, and no one cares to find fault with it. Even Bishops, who cannot sanction it, witness it, and are silent. Who can help asking, 'Have we all the freedom we require?' And who can help answering, 'No?' We are sure that our Bishops might be most wisely entrusted with the power of sanctioning exceptional services, such as that of which we are speaking. The Act of Uniformity Amendment Act, commonly known as the 'Shortened Services Act,' was good so far as it went. The day must come when we shall have to go farther, if our Church is to meet the requirements of the age, and to put forth all her energies. A wisely controlled liberty must in time, and by degrees, supplant a somewhat straitened uniformity. The old garb is already bursting its seams on more sides than one.

We turn now to another marked feature of Parochial Missions. Opportunity is always given on these occasions for private interviews between the Missioner and those desirous of consulting him. Of course this opens up at once the whole question of private confession, which in the Church of

Rome is made an essential part of Mission work, and is among ourselves more or less advocated by many conductors of Missions. Now, whilst we ourselves distinctly accept the position apparently taken up by our Prayer-Book, and acquiesce in private confession being treated as an exceptional resource for the comfort of consciences specially burdened with sin, we neither deny, nor doubt that much blessing has been granted to methods of dealing with individual souls which aim at no such carefully adjusted medium, but either, on the one side, interpret the exceptions with considerable freedom, or, on the other side, excluding it altogether, are content with informal conference. We are not anxious to condemn *any* system, however little we might sympathise with it. But we do wish to impress upon any Missioners who may read this article the desirableness of letting their views and practice with regard to confession be distinctly known before the Mission begins. If the Missioner says nothing upon the point, his private interviews will be certain to be suspected, and many will shrink from them lest they should be pressed to make confession. Let him say in a preliminary letter exactly how far and in what cases he is prepared to recommend it, and the people will then know what to expect. This is much better than preaching about it, for the subject is an exciting one, and is very difficult to preach about without rousing opposition or leading to controversy. And nothing is so fatal to the true work of a Mission as the infusion of a controversial spirit into the minds of the people. We believe the private help and counsel of the Missioner to be of such great value, that all possible care should be taken not by any negligence to lessen this value.

We desire now to touch upon a matter of some difficulty, which we are convinced is of more importance in the conduct of a Mission than may at first sight appear. We refer to the desirableness of some arrangement as to the times for private conferences with men and women respectively. There is always some danger of the Mission becoming a feminine thing. No doubt the men almost always come well to the Mission services. We have never known a Mission in which the large attendance of men has not been a marked feature. But the women are more emotional, more demonstrative, and less shy than the men. They respond far more readily to the Missioner's invitation to private interviews. And it is obviously undesirable that a number of excitable women, and especially young women, should remain after a late service to a still later hour for the purpose of spiritual

conference with the Mission Priest. We do not say that this can be wholly avoided. There are doubtless parishes where the women are at work all day, and have therefore no other opportunities of taking advantage of the Mission than the men have. But we cannot help thinking that in many Missions it would be a very desirable thing to announce that, while women might consult the Missioner at any time during the day (or during certain specified hours of the day), none but men would be seen privately after the Mission Service at night. We shall have to say a word before we conclude about separate meetings for men, but at present we are speaking only of private interviews, and we believe the plan we have suggested might not only be more wholesome for the women, but might also encourage the men to make freer use of the opportunity reserved specially for themselves. We need hardly say how paramount is the obligation to do all that can be done for the men. The women are far more open to the ordinary influences of the pastor's daily work in his parish. He finds them at home when the men are at work. And a Mission is next thing to a failure which lays hold only of the women, while it has little to do with the men of the parish. We are ungallant enough to say that (in *this* aspect at least) one man is worth half-a-dozen women. It is of primary importance to the whole cause of Parochial Missions that they should be rescued from the charge of effeminacy, and should boldly grapple with the sterner and harder realities of life, with strong men's sins and strong men's wants, and should be recognised as, in their character and dealings, robust, manly, straightforward and practical.

This part of the subject is treated with great wisdom by Père Nampon, and although he advocates a separation of sexes far more complete than would probably be possible in ordinary cases, his remarks are so suggestive that we make no apology for quoting them. Acknowledging that many eminent Missioners have not acted upon the principle, Père Nampon strongly urges the great advantage of collecting the men and the women at different hours. He considers that this plan more than compensates for the additional labour in the multiplication of addresses. Of course he would assemble the women in the daytime and the men at night after their work is over, but he would begin the day with a service and short address, to which both men and women should be invited. In favour of his plan of separation he argues (1) that the hour most convenient for the men is too late for women; (2) that men are more willing to come to an instruction specially

intended for them, as well as less deterred by the fear of observation when coming in the dark with a number of other men; (3) that there is less difficulty in placing them well when the church is given up to them, and they sing and take part in the service much better when thus forming a separate congregation; (4) that the preacher can produce greater effect at a late hour, and, while the men need such a stimulus to the imagination, it might be unwholesomely exciting to women; (5) that an infinity of abuses are prevented by the separation of the sexes, and although these abuses are wilfully exaggerated by the enemies of Missions, still no one should be able to say anything against them, and it is right to avoid every least pretext for unkindly comment.

Now we imagine it would be no easy matter to carry out this separation of sexes in our Missions, though we should like to see the experiment tried. But there is too much good sense in M. Nampon's counsel for it to be simply put aside as impracticable. It may at least teach us the value of separating the sexes in our arrangements for private interviews, and of conducting as much of the more general work of the Mission as possible upon the same principle.

In close connexion with this subject we must mention the immense benefit which is frequently found to flow from gatherings of men only during a Mission. These can easily be arranged for on the Sunday afternoons, as well as at a late hour (9.0 or 9.30) on two or three of the nights during the week. It is a grand thing to address a church full, or a schoolroom full, of men. Most clergymen, even though they may get used to it, from time to time bewail the preponderance of women in their congregations. We suspect that sometimes a feminine audience is the natural consequence of feminine preaching. But, be that as it may, there is no doubt men will come to church if they think the clergyman they will hear there has got something special to say to them, and is likely to say it in a plain, manly, straightforward manner. And it must stir a man's heart and fire his lips, if he is worth anything at all, to see before him a large body of men come to learn something from him, if only he has got it to tell them, which may help them in their desperate battle with the strong, defiant, masterful sins of men.

There is another class for whom some special provision should be made in a Mission, namely, the children. We guard at once against being supposed to advocate any sort of attempt to work up the feelings of children by exciting preaching or sensational services. Nothing could be more unnatural or

unwholesome. Yet the children must not be forgotten. We would always have some short, hearty, and interesting services for them, when they should be spoken to with extreme simplicity, yet very lovingly and earnestly. If in the address given them some little anecdote or allegory can be told, it will help them to remember the lesson. But children must be dealt with *as children* and not as adults, and for them the primary duties of the child, such as truth and obedience, are the fitting subjects of exhortation, not the deep and lofty themes which must be handled in addressing their elders. We would recommend that parents be not encouraged to bring young children to the late Mission services. They will not be wholesome for either mind or body.

If the Mission is to do any real good, it is of primary importance that all who have the conduct of it should from first to last remember its true character and purpose. It is but a beginning of better things in a place, a new impulse, a fresh start. It has no completeness, no finality, in itself. All its work must regard the future, or it is vain. We have heard of clergy who, having failed to effect much in their parishes, or to win the confidence of their people, have fancied that a Mission would do their work for them, and set all to rights. No more utter mistake could be made. Unless there is in the place a backbone of earnest religious people, ready to work before the Mission, and ready to work after it, it is better not to have a Mission at all. It will either be a mere momentary flash in the pan, or will send recruits to the Dissenting chapels. A Mission ought to map out abundance of hard work for the future. Part of its work will always be to gather up materials for after use. Those who are impressed will be registered and drafted into various classes for the instruction they need. Bible classes, Confirmation classes, Communicants' classes, will be filled. New volunteers for the increased work will come forward, and a personal interest will be taken in all. We are not drawing on the imagination, or picturing what we think ought to be. We are relating simple facts within our own knowledge. It may be not unprofitable, for example, to enumerate some of the present results of a Mission held last year, for which we can vouch from personal acquaintance. These are as follow:—(1) a large weekly gathering of men for Bible reading; (2) a Sunday class of elderly men; (3) a Sunday class of young men; (4) a weekly 'Mothers' meeting; (5) a large Sunday class of married women; (6) a Sunday class of unmarried women; (7) a second ditto; (8) a large accession of Sunday teachers

for children, resulting in the doubling of the number of scholars. These results are no doubt unusually satisfactory, and are due to the hearty and self-denying work of the laity of the parish. We name them as showing the sort of work that a Mission should leave behind it. But it is not only in its after-work that a Mission must be made practical. The conductor will be on the watch from first to last to direct every emotion into some practical channel. For this purpose all who will are encouraged to form definite practical resolutions, and special forms are provided for the solemn recording of these in the presence of the Missioner, who acts as witness to the making of the resolution, counselling, and praying with the person making it. But this is one of those details of the work which we should not have brought forward, except for the purpose of illustrating the distinctly practical character which should mark, and we believe does in a large majority of cases mark, the Mission work. It is not only in the quickening or deepening of personal religion, or in the development of multiplied plans of usefulness, that the practical fruits of a Mission are to be looked for; but they are constantly recognised in such obvious ways as in the reconciliation of those who have been living in enmity (for which, indeed, careful arrangement as to time and place appears to be frequently made in foreign Missions), in restitution of stolen money or dishonest gains, in the smoothing of little domestic jars and irritations, in acts of self-sacrificing liberality, and in a variety of other ways which prove that all is not unreal excitement or evanescent emotion. We may add that a most noticeable result of almost all well-conducted Missions is a fuller and deeper appreciation of the quiet, ordinary, unexciting system of the Church; a marked increase in the attendance at daily prayer, in the number of regular Communicants, in the roll of Confirmation candidates, and the like; so that the attempt to set in opposition to one another, as antagonistic and incompatible, the more exciting agency of the Mission and the calmer system of the Church is not supported by the evidence of facts.

We have written favourably to the cause of Parochial Missions, because we believe they may be made an instrument of great good, if wisely ordered, and carefully guarded. But we have not written in forgetfulness of the dangers to which they are exposed on more sides than one. It will be well to speak a few words of warning as to these dangers before we end. They seem to us both doctrinal and practical. We would earnestly pray all who have to do with

Parochial Missions to be on their guard against the temptation (which the Mission undoubtedly presents) to offer to the people easy ready-made ways of salvation. Beware of short cuts in the 'narrow way.' On the one side, there is the temptation to exalt private confession and priestly absolution into a panacea for all ills, and to invite young persons to avail themselves of it as the one thing which they need, and which will give them safety and peace ; while, on the other side, there is the temptation to exalt the feelings into a semi-miraculous evidence of grace, and to imperil the soul by the assumption of a false security. It is dangerous to trust to either priestly absolution or self-absolution. There may be over-reliance on either the objective or the subjective assurance. We are bound to say that our own experience leads us to believe that private confession has been very carefully dealt with by the generality of Missioners, and that even those who advocate and use it freely have invariably striven to fall in with the teaching and practice of the parochial clergy who have invited them. We are not quite so sure that the Wesleyan preaching of conversion and assurance has not, on the other side, been made use of more unguardedly. We of course refer to such preaching of conversion and assurance as is beyond, or out of harmony with, the teaching of our own Church. No one is ignorant of the very remarkable combination of the two opposite principles we have named, originating with the late Mr. Aitken, and characterising at the present time the teaching of some of his able and eloquent disciples. It is well to gather truths on all sides and from all schools of thought, but we have certainly heard teaching upon these momentous matters which it would be hard to fit in harmoniously with the doctrinal system of the Church of England. Of practical dangers we would single out two, which are to some extent analogous to the two doctrinal ones we have named. We can imagine nothing, on the one hand, more hurtful to the cause of Missions (to put the matter on a low ground) than any even apparent mimicry of Roman ceremonies and practices. Even should some such observances be in themselves innocent and edifying, we are English Churchmen : we belong to a Church which, while catholic in standing and in doctrine, has its individuality of system and character ; and we would have men see that we love and revere our Church, not (as is the fashion of some) apologising shamefacedly for all that is distinctive and English in her, but glorying in her as the best and purest branch of the great Vine, and determined not to mar a work we are trying to do for God by anything, however

in itself harmless, which may engender suspicions of disloyalty. We have referred repeatedly to M. Nampon's interesting and suggestive book, but can any one read his description of Romish Missions without a fervent hope that we may be preserved from the constant array of attractive processions and imposing effects, which form so natural and ordinary a part of the foreign repertory of Mission agencies, but are so utterly un-English, and so essentially out of harmony with the gravity and solid earnestness of the work we, as English Churchmen, can commend? Then, on the other hand, we would once again strenuously protest against lowering the Mission work by sentimentalism, effeminateness, unreality. There is a very real peril of sins against truth, honesty, and manliness,—not, of course, of intention, but through excessive interest in the emotional side of the work. Affectionateness of appeals, fervency of exhortation, without a solid substratum of dogmatic teaching, are a snare into which Missioners have been known to fall; while we have heard of some who, going about in the Church and speaking to persons on their knees at the after-meetings, have, by their indiscreet warmth and eagerness of manner and action, repelled sober-minded persons, and even given occasion to the uncharitable to speak uncharitably.

It is no easy task, for which any clergyman with some earnestness of heart and readiness of language is fitted, to conduct a Parochial Mission. We have heard of those who have taken such keen delight in the work as to long at the close of one Mission to enter at once upon another. We cannot understand such feelings. To us the conduct of a Mission appears to be so grave and difficult and responsible a task as to be all but appalling. And we have a word, in conclusion, to say to those who are thinking of undertaking this particular branch of work. Our word is this, and we say it with a deep conviction of its truth: Let no man venture into this thing who is not perfectly sure of the truth of his own personal religion and of the security of his own personal faith. It is not the preaching and the instructions which will try him. But in his private conferences he will inevitably be brought face to face with the deepest and hardest questions which a man can be called upon to front in these days. Not alone will he have to deal with the mysteries which are intertwined with a hundred different phenomena of the inner life of the soul, mysteries of prayerlessness, of apathy, of unlovingness, of despondency, of temptation, of natural weakness of character, of besetting infirmities, and the like. That were

hard enough. But he will find himself at once in the presence of a secret stream of miserable doubt and infidelity, flowing stealthily along, and flooding the purest, brightest, holiest souls with its dark waters, revealing itself where least suspected by himself or others, and the cause of a hidden misery and dread which he is called upon to grapple with and to overcome. If he be not a strong man, let him look to it, or his own faith will be sorely shaken as he listens to the piteous tales of the doubts of others. A true Missioner must be a many-sided man; a man who can lift the sinner from the mire, probe below the surface of the shallow and self-satisfied, comfort the faint-hearted, explain the difficulties of the perplexed, advise according to the most varying needs of most varying characters, being a skilful casuist in the best sense of the word. But, above all, he must know well the special dangers of the day, and, while ready and versed in the refutation of false doctrines of many sorts, he must, most of all, have studied the subtleties of scepticism, and, strong in his own undoubting faith, be ready and able to set the feet of his tottering brother or sister upon the same rock on which his own are planted.

ART. VII.—MONTENEGRO.

1. *Geschichte des Fürstenthums Montenegro, von der ältesten Zeit bis zum Jahre 1852.* Von ALEXANDER ANDRIE. (Wien, 1853.)
2. *La Souveraineté du Monténégro et le Droit des Gens moderne de l'Europe.* Par JEAN VACLIC. (Paris, 1858.)
3. *Le Monténégro, Histoire, Description, Mœurs, &c.* Par HENRI DELARUE. (Paris, 1862.)
4. *Les Serbes de Turquie.* Par A. UBICINI. (Paris, 1865.)
5. *Tzrna Gora.* ARCHIMANDRITA N. DOUSITCH. (Belgrade [Belgrade] 1874.)

THE war which from time to time has threatened to involve almost the whole of Europe, and which, however localised, can hardly end without permanently affecting the relations of the provinces of the Porte and the liminary States, has made Montenegro a household word in this country. As this small Principality is but little known to Englishmen, and as it has

now risen to an importance wholly incommensurate with its size and the number of its inhabitants, we purpose, from the materials named at the head of this article, and from notes made during a short visit to that country, to place before our readers a brief account of the territory and people of Montenegro.¹ Apart, however, from its share in the war with Turkey, Montenegro deserves our attention, and may claim a portion of that gratitude which we owe to Sobieski and the conquerors at Lepanto. A larger share, indeed, than they; since this small handful of mountaineers has struggled for centuries against the Ottoman power and has beaten back its forces even when in the full career of victory; and has thus served as a breakwater against the inundation which seemed about to sweep away all vestiges of civilisation, of freedom, and of Christianity from Europe.

The reason for one half of the name by which this land of desolate mountains is known in all languages is matter of dispute. Its cold gray limestone ridges, looking black by contrast with the lighter hue of the Dalmatian hills; the dark pine-forests, which, it is said, once covered great portions of its mountains;² the terror with which the Montenegrins inspired the Turkish inhabitants of the lowlands;³ and the name of one of the dynasties which formerly ruled this country,⁴ have been assigned by one writer or another as the meaning of part of its name of Montenegro in the Venetian dialect of Italian, of *Tzrnagora* in Slavonic, and of *Karadagh* in Turkish. Be this as it may, there is no doubt as to the remainder of the name by which the country is known. Politically, as well as geographically and historically, Montenegro is pre-eminently a land of mountains. Its strength, in

¹ On one or two points we have availed ourselves of personal information derived from the writer of the last-named book on our list. We made the acquaintance of the Archimandrite Nicephorus Dousitch, at Cettigne, where we found him busied with the schools of which he was inspector, and interested in the literary questions discussed in the learned societies of Europe. He is a member of the scientific and historical societies of Dalmatia and Servia; and his contributions to literature are numerous, and esteemed. Of polished, pleasing address, set off by a *physique* which becomes a Montenegrin, he is a remarkable man. When the woes of Herzegovina drove the people into insurrection, he was peaceably pursuing his clerical duties at Belgrade, whither he had gone from Cettigne. From these and his books he rushed at the cry of his country, and has since proved himself one of the ablest of its soldiers. Few troops have been abler led; none by a more learned commander.

² Sir Gardner Wilkinson, *Dalmatia and Montenegro*.

³ Mariano Bolizza in *Relazione e Descrizione del Sangiacato di Scutari. M.S. Venetia*, 1614. Quoted by M. Ubicini, p. 142.

⁴ Cyprien Robert, *Les Sclaves de Turquie*.

all wars with Turkey, is due to the inaccessible nature of the retreats, from which swarms of irregular soldiers have issued to repel the attacks of fanatical hordes and of veteran armies. Its songs, almost its only literature, are inspired by the mountain breeze. The character of its hardy inhabitants is such as is only found in mountainous countries. And the chaos of limestone, either prolonged in short ridges, serrated and rugged with bluff irregular spurs, or bent in a circle enclosing a plain of fertile land, as the crater is girdled by the sides of a volcano, is the key to the history of this people in their long struggle to maintain their independence, and will account in some measure for the success which has crowned their efforts, from the day when at Kossova the Servian power was broken and its monarchy lost, down to our own time, when the troops of Turkey keep ceaseless watch over its northern, eastern, and southern frontiers. The chronicles of Montenegro are written in the popular songs which record feats of individual heroism, such as rugged mountain territory alone renders possible, and no other high-land country can rival.

The north-eastern frontier of Montenegro, formed by a ridge of the Dinarian Alps, is separated from Servia by a strip of broken ground in the occupation of Turkey. On the north-west it has for its boundary an offset from the same ridge of mountains, running almost at right angles with the rest of the range, and stretching almost to the Adriatic near Ragusa. Within this line, however, lies the fertile vale of Niksitch, held by the Turks, although ethnologically, as well as geographically and socially, a part of Montenegro. Another mountain ridge, broken by a succession of lofty peaks, shuts out Montenegro from the sea, and forms its south-western boundary. On the south-east towards Albania the frontier differs in character from those on the other three sides. Here the mountains sink into the plain, the gorges are wider, the breadth of fertile land greater, and the country depends for its defence upon the valour of its sons, and not upon any feature of nature, and the line of separation between Montenegro and Turkey is made up in part by easy slopes of the various mountain ridges, which, however irregular in their formation, have almost always a southern direction; in part by the rivers Zenta and Moratcha and by smaller streams.

In shape, Montenegro has been compared to the leaf of a plane-tree, to which it bears a general resemblance. Perhaps a better idea of its shape may be obtained by joining two right-angled triangles at the apex of each, allowing

one somewhat to overlap the other. It lies between $42^{\circ} 10'$ and $42^{\circ} 56'$ of north latitude and $18^{\circ} 41'$ and $20^{\circ} 22'$ of east longitude. The greatest length of the Principality, from east to west, is about fifty-five miles; its greatest breadth, from north to south, about thirty-eight miles. In the centre, however, the Turkish territory on both sides indents that of Montenegro so considerably, that its northern frontier,—on the side of Herzegovina,—is only distant some twelve miles from the first Turkish post in Albania. Its superficial extent is estimated at seventy geographical miles square. It is, however, not easy to compute the area of Montenegro, because of the irregularity of its frontier; nor, when computed, do the figures give more than an imperfect idea of the real extent of the country, since the sides of the mountains, sterile as they are, are tenanted by peasants who cultivate with the utmost care the smallest patch of ground which has been formed in the crevices of the mountain-slopes by the decay of vegetable matter and the disintegration of the rocks during long ages. There are few more striking instances of parsimonious industry than that presented to the traveller on his ride from Cattaro to Cettigne, than the small plots—we can scarcely call them fields,—of wheat; maize, capsicums, or potatoes, lying in the hollows of the rocks. Corn-fields, twenty feet by twelve, and potato-grounds less than six feet square, are of frequent occurrence.¹ Such a spectacle of industry can hardly be seen in any other country in the world. In the valleys on the southern frontier, where the country descends, on one side towards Lake Skodra, and on the other overlooks Boudna and Antivara on the Adriatic, the soil is not only more fertile than the rest of Montenegro, but agriculture and horticulture have advanced to a degree of perfection which would be observable in any country. There the hills are terraced for vineyards, and fig and pomegranate orchards add largely to the exports of the Principality.

Though springs of water gush from the sides of the loftiest mountains, there is a singular absence of anything resembling a cascade in the whole country, and streams which rise here to the dignity of rivers would elsewhere be considered unimportant. Of these the Zeta or Zenta, which gave its name to the whole country formerly ruled by the Princes of Montenegro, of which the present Principality is but a fragment, rises near the town of Niksitch, and flowing

¹ 'I saw clearings of so small a size as barely to admit of one potato plant or three of maize, and little fields but one yard in diameter.'—*Rambles in Istria, Dalmatia, and Montenegro*, p. 249.

through the beautiful valley of Bielopavolich, falls into the Moratcha, between Spurg and Podgoritz, near the ruins of Dioclea. The length of this river is about seventeen miles. The Rjeka, near the village of the same name, though possessing a larger volume of water than the Zeta, has a shorter course, its length being less than ten miles. It is, however, navigable almost to its source. It is a characteristic of the rivers on the Dalmatian coast of the Adriatic, that they burst from their source in a full volume of water. The waters of the Rjeka, after being joined by those of a smaller stream, the Karatuna, near Jablack, falls into the lake of Skodra. Viewed either from the rocks above, or from its surface, this stream is one of rare beauty. Its borders are fringed with the Raketa (*salix caprea*, Lin.), with pomegranate bushes and fig-trees, and through a great part of the year are gay with the purple blossoms of the former shrub, or afire with the scarlet blossoms of the pomegranate. Except in the character of its vegetation, the Rjeka resembles a highland river, and widens throughout its course into lake-like reaches, which appear to be closed in on all sides by the grey sterile rocks rising from its bed. The effect of this breadth of water is, however, in a great measure, lost, in consequence of the fields of rushes and water-lilies, white and yellow, which cover the whole surface of the water, except in the centre of the stream. These form a cover for gulls and other aquatic birds, and shelter numerous families of coots, water-hens, and dive-dappers. The mouths of the ravines, which open upon this river, give the traveller glimpses of white gabled cottages, peeping out of clusters of walnut, cornel, and pomegranate trees. A third river, the Tzrnitz, has its source in the mountains overhanging the bay of Spizza, near the junction of the Turkish, Austrian, and Montenegrin frontiers. This river is the shortest of any of the streams which rise in Montenegro. It falls, like all the others, into the lake of Skodra at the north-western corner. The Moratcha, the most considerable of these rivers, though it rises within Montenegro, and forms for awhile the boundary between that country and Albania, loses this character for the greater part of its course, and then flows exclusively through Turkish territory.

Montenegro proper, as distinguished from the Berda, or eastern half of the Principality, is for the most part a rocky plateau, rising upwards of 4,000 feet above the level of the sea. Bastion-shaped depressions, like enormous craters, and valleys or gorges resembling deep chasms, occur through-

out the broken table-land, whilst from the rocky plateau itself solitary peaks and short irregular ridges of mountains rise to a great height above the rough base from which they spring. This great plateau, Montenegro proper, terminates eastward at the valley of Bielopavolich and the banks of the Zeta. The Berda,¹ though a great part of it is, like the western part of the Principality, an irregular plain of mountain country, rather than a land of mountain ranges, is here and there broken by a succession of wild, irregular valleys, and partakes more than western Montenegro of the general character of mountainous countries, a land of steep precipitous ridges rising directly from the plain. Though the peaks and ridges of the country lie for the most part in the interior of the country and on the northern or Herzegovinian frontier, yet Vegliverch, a little to the north of Risano, and Mount Lovtchin, which towers above Cattaro, are among the most considerable of the mountain heights of the Trznagora. Montenegro, however, it must be borne in mind, is not so much a mountainous country as a mountain mass, hollowed by fissures and penetrated by occasional gorges, opening occasionally into valleys of moderate width.

The geological formation of the Principality is compact grey limestone, with occasional instances of dolomite. The plains in the south are of the same character as those of north Albania which they join: a coarse conglomerate, so coarse, indeed, as to be scarcely distinguished from the ruins of Roman masonry, which abound in all directions on the frontier of Montenegro. On the opposite side of the country, overlooking the vale of Niksitch, the traveller will meet with singular deposits of small pebbles thrown up in heaps as on a sea-beach, and almost as difficult to walk over as the loose stones of a sea-shore. Lignite is found near the banks of the Rjeka, and there are said to be indications of coal in some parts. This, however, is doubtful; for the geology of Montenegro has never been investigated. Probably, when the country has been explored by scientific travellers, the limestone ridges will be found of greater value than they seem at present. As yet their chief value is in the supply of stone for building. The hardness of this stone, and the polish which it takes, render it well adapted for this purpose, and it supplies the only material of which palace and churches, monasteries and peasants' cabins are built.

The soil of Montenegro is of so porous a character that after a few hours no trace remains of the heaviest rains, and

¹ 'Berda,' plural of 'berdo,' a mountain.

the hay-crops are often burnt up during the prolonged drought of summer. Some small streams, after a short course, are altogether absorbed, and disappear underground. The plain around Cettigne, the capital, girdled by high crags, and resembling the huge crater of an extinct volcano, is wholly composed of sand, as though it had once been the bed of the sea. Were it not that the excessive dryness of the climate is in part corrected by the dense fogs of the Adriatic, which bring with them torrents of rain, this territory would be utterly sterile and the few rivers which flow through it would be soon dried up. Delarue thus describes one of these fogs and its attendant fall of rain :¹—

‘Some days after my arrival in Montenegro I witnessed one of those storms which are so welcome during the intense heat of summer. About seven o’clock in the evening a dense fog covered the whole plain. The darkness was so great that the nearest objects were invisible. The rain fell in sheets of water; the lightnings played along the heights which rise around the basin of Cettigne, and crowned them with circles of fire. All night long and until the next day the thunder crashed without intermission. When morning came the plain around the capital wore the appearance of a swamp, and broad pools covered the whole of the ground. The corn was entirely under water, and the wells, which the evening before were almost dry, were now overflowing. Every trace of the storm, every vestige of water disappeared during the day.’

The different elevation of the various districts of Montenegro causes some diversity of climate. In the south the summers are scorching and the winters mild. In the north, where the country is much higher than on the Albanian frontier, the breezes which sweep across Hungary temper the heat of summer and increase the rigour of winter. On the heights snow remains for most part of the year, and Rjeka is smiling with the luxuriant verdure of June whilst the heights overlooking the town are white with the snows of December. This difference of climate at different elevations gives variety to the productions of Montenegro. In the north, wheat, rye and barley, maize, capsicums, and tobacco, are reared. In the south, vines, pomegranates, figs, peaches, apples, cherries, citrons, oranges, olives, mulberries, and tobacco, are the chief productions. Cabbages, cauliflowers, potatoes, white and scarlet runners, pease, melons, radishes and onions, grow around almost every cottage, and supply food alike for the tenant’s family and the litter of pigs in the sty. In swamps, near the source of the Rjeka, Mirko, the father of

¹ *Le Monténégro*. Par Henri Delarue.

the reigning Prince, had sown rice, and, between Danilograd and Seto-Gradatz, the same warrior farmer had an experimental plantation of coffee; what success, however, he met with in these attempts, we are unable to say. The potato was introduced into the country in 1786, by the Vladika Peter I., and its cultivation extended in a very short time throughout the whole Principality, where it is largely used, and sold in considerable quantities in the adjacent market towns of Turkey and Austria. According to Sir Gardner Wilkinson, the common trees of the country, in addition to those enumerated, are the oak, ilex, beech, ash, acacia, firs, hazels, wild pears, poplars, willows, and alders. The underwood on the hill-sides consists of oak and beech scrub, arbutus, juniper, myrtle, and bramble, and where the ground is not covered with these shrubs, savoury wild thyme and mint scent the air, and a profusion of clematis and other wild flowers climb the rocks on all sides, and furnish the pasture ground from which the excellent honey of Montenegro is extracted. These wild flowers, we believe, are the only flowers in Montenegro. Ground is too precious to be used for unproductive purposes; and ornamental flowers are, so far as our experience serves, unknown. Perhaps the most valuable of all the trees in Montenegro is the scottano or Venus sumach (*rhus cotinus*); the wood of this tree is valuable for tanning and dyeing, and large quantities are exported to Trieste, to Ancona, and to Marseilles. The mulberry-tree, chiefly the white variety, is cultivated by most of the cottagers in the southern part of the country; and silk is fast becoming one of the most important articles exported from Montenegro. Around Danilograd are nursery-grounds belonging to the Prince; and in these large quantities of mulberry-trees are reared and distributed gratuitously to any peasants who may desire them. In the war of 1862, the army of Omar Pasha penetrated as far as this village, and destroyed every tree which Prince Danilo had planted. Though the mulberry plantation at Danilograd again flourishes, it will take many years to repair the waste made by the Turks.

Sheep and goats are reared in great numbers throughout Montenegro; and their wool and cheese are largely exported. The smoke-dried mutton (*castradina*) of these mountains is well known in the markets of Istria and Venice, and is purchased in large quantities for the Austrian navy. Other productions, which are exported, are dried fish (*scoranza*), tortoise-shell, wax, honey, hides, figs, olives, cheese, mutton, tallow, dye, and firewood, charcoal, cattle, sheep, pigs, mats,

ice, maize, vegetables, silk, and tobacco. Much of this is carried across the Turkish and Austrian frontiers and shipped to distant countries. The heavy transit dues of Austria, however, deprive the peasants of much of their fair profits. It is one of the hardships which press upon this people, that they are debarred from the small and, to Turkey, useless, ports at the foot of the mountains, such as Spica and Antivara. Were these in the possession of Montenegro, these outlets for their produce and their energies would have prevented many a war with Turkey. In justice to this latter Power, it must be recorded that the Porte would long since have yielded them to the Montenegrins, but for the interference of Austria, fearful lest the existence of a free port so near her Dalmatian territory would interfere with the monopoly which her goods possess, and give to English fabrics an entrance into the northern and western provinces of European Turkey.

The *scoranza* (*ouklieva*, Serb.), which is an important item in the exports from Montenegro, leaves the lake of Skodra in the month of September, and finds its way into the Rjeka, where it is taken in great quantities, cured, and exported to Turkey, Dalmatia, and Italy. In size and flavour this fish resembles a sardine. This fishery is the property of the Government, and is of such importance to the Montenegrins that the season for taking the fish is formally opened by a state visit of the Prince. Though this fish is the chief article of commerce, the rivers throughout Montenegro abound in other kinds of fish. The trout, which is excellent in flavour, attains an enormous size. The eels of the Rjeka are also large and excellent in quality, and perch and carp are taken in large numbers. Game is not abundant, though hares and rabbits are found; the bird most in request is the red-legged partridge. Wild ducks, however, frequent Lake Skodra; the traveller may see flocks of wild pigeons in many parts of the country, and the black-cock is not an uncommon bird. Those who prefer the more exciting objects of the chase will, in addition to the stag, meet with the boar on the Bosnian frontier, the wolf, which in sharp winters prowls to the neighbourhood of Cettigne, and the wild boar, which makes its lair on the banks of the Moratcha. As to the smaller birds, the absence of forest-land and the infrequency of hedgerows perhaps account for so few song-birds visiting Montenegro. Flocks of starlings, however, crows and magpies, may be seen on the open ground, and coots, water-hens, and gulls are common on the rivers; whilst hawks, eagles, and occasionally a vulture hold undisputed possession of the mountain solitudes.

The extent and state of the public roads are sometimes assumed as criterions by which to test the social condition of a nation. This, however, would not afford a true test of Montenegrin civilisation. Here a bad road has hitherto been a cherished political institution. Surrounded on all sides by watchful enemies, in an almost chronic state of warfare with Turkey, coveted by Austria, and more than desired by the first Napoleon, the maintenance of Montenegrin independence has been a hindrance to the construction of such roads as the commerce of the country, and even the necessities of the simple social life of its inhabitants, would seem to demand. In the time of the Vladika Peter I., the Emperor Napoleon offered in vain to construct a road from Cattaro to Cettigne, probably with a view of extending it to Skodra. However inconvenient to the traveller the want of good roads may be, what is of far greater consequence, the safety of the country, is best maintained without them, and this consideration in past times prevented their construction, except to a very limited extent. The present Prince, however, has, like his predecessor, Prince Danilo, constructed several roads for interior communication. Long use and highland agility render the rough roads of the Principality as easy to its inhabitants as level ground. Between Cettigne and Rjeka, the Vladika Peter II. constructed what on the whole must be considered a fair road; and between most villages paths have been formed which diminish the fatigue of travelling without impairing the difficult nature of the country. The road from Rjeka, running south along the precipitous heights overlooking the left bank of the river of the same name, is of this description; wide enough at the narrowest point for two horsemen to pass, at least with some manœuvring—easy for the sure-footed and agile horses of the country, but capable of being blocked and destroyed in the face of any hostile force which might attempt to penetrate into Montenegro from the Albanian frontier. Such being the state of the roads throughout the country, it is scarcely necessary to remark that carts and carriages are unknown throughout Montenegro. Probably, four wheels are not to be found in the whole of the mountain territory.

Between those who say that, with some three or four exceptions, Montenegro possesses no villages, and those who reckon the number of the villages scattered throughout the country at some three hundred and fifty, the difference is rather verbal than real. In the English use of the word there are very few villages. When the capital of the country,

the seat of Government and the residence of the Prince and Archbishop, consists of about fifty houses, it is not to be expected that the villages will be populous. Except Negush and Rjeka, most villages are too inconsiderable to deserve that name. In no other country, at least in Europe, would three or four cottages standing together be called a village. In fact, the *celo* or village of Montenegro is a territorial division of the *pleme* or tribe, and the *celo* is made up of scattered houses, *koutcha*,—that is, of families, more or less numerous, aggregated together. When, then, we read, according to a recent census, of 11,811 houses in the Principality, we must remember that this does not mean cottages divided by a party-wall, but families owning obedience to one head, and preserving a family relationship.¹ The small farmsteads and cottages throughout this country are built with reference to convenience in the culture of the land, rather than to safety, in accessible not inaccessible sites. This is in keeping with the self-dependent, fearless character of these mountaineers. The same fearlessness has led the Montenegrin peasants to build their cottages detached instead of seeking to cluster them together. This custom, coupled with the fact that almost every cottage, and indeed the monasteries and churches, are provided with loop-holes for defence against an invader, presents a singular admixture of consciousness to danger, and of reliance on their own valour to repel hostile assaults.

Cettigne, the capital of Montenegro, may claim the distinction of being the smallest metropolis in the world. It stands in the midst of a sandy plain, shut in by precipitous rocks, and consists of little more than two streets, the longer one containing two or three poor inns and about thirty houses, some few of which rise to the dignity of one story. From this street a shorter one runs at right angles, containing the new residence of the Prince, and opposite to it the Government printing-office: the old half-Turkish house, formerly occupied by the Vladika, and until recently tenanted by Prince Nicholas. A few paces from this—the old palace,—stands, on an abrupt ascent, an ecclesiastical building, at once the cathedral of the diocese, the parish church of Cettigne, and the chapel of the monastery: the capitular, the parochial, and the monastic authorities consisting of the archbishop, the archimandrite of the convent, and one priest, who, in addition to being secretary to the Prince and senate, was also director of the printing-press of the Principality.

¹ Ubicini, *Les Serbes de Turquie*, pp. 148-150.

If we added that he was not only director of the press, but also compositor, and occasionally press-man, that he compiled as well as printed the *Cettigne Almanac*, and wrote many of the poems which enliven its pages and adds to its popularity throughout Montenegro, we believe we should only assign to him some of his proper offices. Let not the reader smile: this concentration of duties is in keeping with the economy which reigns throughout the Black Mountains, and both Prince and people are fortunate in the holder of so many offices, the exercise of which recalls the times when the printing-press of England was sheltered within the cloisters of Westminster. In front of the palace is a carob-tree, under which the Prince dispenses justice, and idlers meet for a gossip during the heat of the day. On a small patch of green adjoining, lie some eight or nine pieces of artillery, of various sizes, the trophies of past wars with the Turks. A stone's throw from this, at the other end of the street, is a small triangular piece of ground, rising from which is a small oil-lamp, lighted on very dark nights. Here, under a plane-tree, round a well, the traveller will find market-women with baskets of eggs, and vegetables.

The route of the traveller who crosses Montenegro, either from the heights above Cattaro or the plain of Albania, lies through the two most important villages in the Principality. An hour-and-a-half's ride from the top of the pass over Cattaro will bring the traveller to Negush, the seat of the powerful family or clan of Petrovitch, the birth-place of Prince Nicholas, and the sanctuary of Montenegrin independence. This village, or rather cluster of seven villages, is scattered over a plain of about half a mile in extent. As in the rest of the country, the chief care in building is not to encroach on land fit for cultivation, the houses are perched here and there without regard to symmetry like grey blocks of stone scattered at random over a stony plain. Formerly the houses were thatched or covered with wood shingles; this, however, is fast disappearing in favour of red tiles. Each of the villages has its own church, and by the roadside is a school-house, built by the present Prince, of good hewn stone. In front of the cottages are little irregular patches of garden ground, shaped as the rocky soil admits, and filled with the usual vegetables, potatoes, beans, melons of various kinds, radishes, cabbage, maize, capsicum, and horse-radish. The other village, which rises almost to the dignity of a town, and approaches nearer to the character of the Dalmatian towns on the Adriatic shore than any other cluster of houses in

Montenegro, stands near the Albanian frontier, on the banks of the stream of the same name, Rjeka. Built on the margin of the river, which sweeps in a semicircle at this spot, the houses rise to the unwonted height of two stories above the ground-floor. A small bazaar and market-place lie behind the houses which face the river. Here most of the embroidery-work for the dress of both sexes is executed, and the handsome features of the women engaged in this feminine task show what, but for their hard toil in the fields, the women of Montenegro would be. This town is the chief market in the Principality for muslin, linen, cloth, and other articles of dress. Rjeka has a good and well-attended school. Though there is much the same distinction between the farm-houses of the larger proprietors and the cottage of the owner of two acres of ground as between the house of a small farmer and of a labourer in England, yet, as the larger proprietors are few in number, and poverty is the lot of the bulk of the people of Montenegro, the description of an ordinary cottage will give a tolerably correct idea of the mode of life prevalent throughout the Principality. We borrow, from a letter of a recent traveller, a sketch of a Montenegrin cottage :—

‘After six hours’ ride, we found ourselves in the little village of Gradatz. On one side of the road was a threshing-floor, raised about ten feet above the pathway, and resting on large uncemented stones. The space below the floor was used as a store-house for straw and maize stalks. The threshing-floor, like all others throughout Montenegro, was cemented and finished with care, and surrounded by a wall of about two feet in height. A white mulberry-tree flung its shade over the threshing-floor. On the other side of the way was a garden wall of uncemented stones, flecked with lichens and half covered with blackberry-bushes. Inside the wall a pigsty and another mulberry-tree filled up the little court. The house itself was but one apartment, partially divided in the centre by hurdles. It had two doors in front, so that it had the appearance of two small houses instead of one large one, and each end was lighted by a small unglazed window or loophole. Behind, the roof of thatch, kept down by means of bands and large stones, rested on the live rock. In front, the wall was of hewn, cemented stone, with here and there a loophole for defence. In the part which I entered, some logs and a wooden chair were all the ostensible seats; others, however, could be extemporised out of boxes and large stones which lay on the earthen floor. Overhead were a few rafters, not, however, to support a ceiling, for there was none, but ranged from wall to wall as a convenient means of supplying the place of cupboards. From these rafters hung strings of onions, a ham or two, some salted fish, and two or three sheets of paper, covered with silkworm’s eggs hung

up for hatching. Two or three earthen jars for water, a wooden bicker for milk, a coarse woollen rug, a child's cradle of primitive construction, a couple of reaping-hooks, a heavy horse-pistol and a rifle, were visible through the dingy atmosphere. On one of the logs sat a woman nursing her infant, two or three other children crowded behind their mother and peered over her shoulder with astonishment at the strangers. In another part of the room, stretched at full length in a sound sleep, was a girl of some fifteen years, and at her feet lay a young calf in apparently the same state of unconsciousness, whilst a couple of dogs contested with the children the occupancy of the floor. Behind the hurdle other members of the family had collected, to watch our movements from a safe distance. This apartment contained the rough boards on which the bedding of the various members of the family could be laid. Rugs and other furniture for beds occupied one corner, and firewood was heaped up in another. On a fire in the centre was placed a pot, the steam from which announced that preparation for dinner was going on. What else there might be I could not see, as the smoke from the beech logs obscured the room before it escaped from the regular outlets in the roof. It was just such a picture as Sir Walter Scott has left us of a Highland cottage of the last century, or such as several estates in Scotland can show at present. The heaps of maize for man and pig, the mulberry-tree, the fig-branches trailing over the wall, the vine heavy with purple clusters of grapes, and the pomegranate bushes on fire with scarlet blossoms, were southern, and gave a local colouring to the scene; but apart from these, it was easy to imagine oneself in some unfrequented spot in the northern part of Great Britain.'

It is not easy to arrive at any satisfactory conclusion as to the population of Montenegro in past times, nor consequently to estimate the rate of increase. The estimates made by travellers in their transit across the Principality are vague and almost useless, whilst the alterations of the frontier-line of Montenegro at different periods of its history diminish the value even of these vague estimates. In the seventeenth century (1614), a Venetian ambassador, in his *Relatione*, computes that the Montenegrins numbered between 30,000 and 35,000. In 1800, according to M. Cyprien Robert, the population of Montenegro, with the recent addition of the Berda, only reached about 50,000—an estimate confirmed by the researches of Colonel Vialla, who states that according to the census the population was 53,168, and the number of men bearing arms and available in time of war 13,292: an estimate only to be accounted for by supposing that he includes men and women in the available forces of the country. In 1820 the population had increased to 75,000, and fifteen years later, in 1835, to 100,000. In 1844, according to the estimates

of M. Robert, their numbers had reached 120,000, and about thirty years later, 1863, the official return, according to the *Cettigne Almanac* of that date, gives 196,228 as the number of people belonging to the Principality.¹ Supposing the estimate made in 1800 to be correct, the population has doubled twice during the present century; that is to say, once in about thirty years—a much higher rate of increase than that of any of the adjoining Christian provinces of Turkey. As the sterility of the rocky soil and the absence of any outlets for their industry prevent an increasing population from finding scope for their energies in their own country, a large number emigrate to various surrounding countries, and the gardens on the Bosphorus, the vegetable markets of Constantinople and of the towns of Asia Minor, are supplied by Montenegrin gardeners—who, however, are enrolled on the books of the Principality, and return to their respective villages at fixed intervals, to be exercised and mustered with the effective strength of the community. In time of war, as at present, they throw up their occupations abroad, and flock to their native country. These families are no doubt included in the census returns. At present the Montenegrins may be estimated to number 220,000. The proportion of men, ready, and expected to bear arms in case of war, is higher than in other countries. Age claims no exemption, and familiarity with arms from, and indeed in, the cradle, makes its sons available at a far earlier age than elsewhere; and it has been noted that in the war with Turkey in 1862 ‘corpses of children under fourteen years of age were frequently reported as found among the slain.’² Holy orders do not hinder any from rendering active service in the field; and in many districts the village pastor, who leads the devotions of his people in peace, approves himself an able captain in times of danger. Like the rest of the Montenegrins, the priests carry arms, and ‘are generally good “heroes,” the first at a gathering, the leaders of their flocks in war.’ The instinct of self-preservation, and the half-religious character of their wars with the Turks—for all their wars hitherto have been defensive—excuse, or even make a virtue of what would be regarded as an impropriety in other civilised communities. Indeed, until the separation of the ecclesiastical and civil functions of the ruler, the Prince-Bishop, like many of the German and even some English bishops in the middle ages, led his subjects into the

¹ The *Gorlitz*, Cettigne.

² *Travels in the South Slavonic Provinces of Turkey*, by Misses Irby and Muir-Mackenzie, p. 619.

field ; and the last two predecessors of Prince Daniel were men who had earned the respect of their people, not only by their administrative ability in Church and State, but also for their physical powers and martial skill. In fact, Montenegro is an armed camp, even more than a nation in which a division of duties and labour can be recognised—a camp girded by the almost inaccessible rampart which nature has thrown up in front of the Albanian plain, and manned by soldiers accustomed to confront danger from infancy, and to regard death in the battle-field as their special privilege and glory. For if 30,000 men, or one-fourth of the male population, can be depended upon to obey the summons of their Prince to arms, and a larger number even than this to hurl back invasions from their mountain homes, even this number of men by no means represents the armed force which would resist the advance of a Turkish army, and guard the rugged defiles which open upon their plains. The girls and women, who share with their brothers and husbands the labours of agriculture, claim also the right to share with them the dangers of war, and whilst the past history of this people abound in instances of female heroism, the national songs which have had so large a share in moulding the Montenegrin character, have preserved the memory, and hold up to imitation the deeds, of the wife who has not only hurried to and fro with food for her husband engaged in the fight, but has stood by his side through the long day of conflict, has loaded his rifle, has borne his banner in the field, and has even aided, with sword in hand, in defending their common country.

Whilst, however, the military force of Montenegro is out of proportion to the number of its inhabitants, its army, in the technical sense of the word, can hardly be said to have any existence. A hundred men chosen from the districts of Montenegro act as guards to the Prince and as messengers to the court. About four hundred others are charged with the preservation of the peace within the country, and act as police officers. These receive a nominal pay, and gain their livelihood, as almost every one else in the Principality, by tilling their rood or bit of land. The captains and standard-bearers of the various districts have charge of the military array of their respective territories, and the zeal and training of the people supply all deficiencies. Upwards of 10,000 men can be assembled at any point of the frontier within twelve hours of the first intimation of danger, and twenty-four hours are sufficient to concentrate almost the whole male population above the age of fourteen. These are

all active skirmishers, efficient marksmen, and excellently suited for such irregular warfare as their country alone admits of. Their simple commissariat consists of a small loaf of bread, a cheese, some garlic, and a little brandy. An old garment and two pairs of sandals, made of raw hide, form all the equipment of the Montenegrins. On their march they seek no shelter from rain or cold. In rainy weather the Montenegrin wraps around his head the *strooka*, a shawl of coarse cloth, lies down on the ground and, putting his rifle under him, sleeps comfortably. Three or four hours of repose are sufficient for his rest, and the remainder of his time is occupied in constant exertion. They resemble, in short, the Highlanders of a century ago, and their military array and accoutrements carry us back to the days of Prince Charles Edward and to the bands which fought at Preston-Pans and Culloden.

The Montenegrins are tall, and well-proportioned, their mien warlike, and their tread firm, like that of mountaineers in general. Their eyes are large, intelligent, and animated, though without the fierce expression of the Turks.¹ Their nose is short and moderately aquiline or straight; their forehead somewhat square; and whilst most of them wear the moustache, none except the clergy have beards. Their complexion, from exposure, is usually of a sunburnt red, and their hair mostly brown. The women are of middle height, thick-set, and with fair but weather-beaten complexions, the result of early toil. In manners, both men and women have a natural unembarrassed air; and travellers agree in praising their intelligence. After speaking of their social customs, Lady Strangford says:—

‘They have another virtue beside this simplicity of life; this is their perfect honesty. I happened to mention that I had dropped a gold bracelet in Albania. “Had you dropped it here, even in the remotest corner of the Black Mountains, it would have been brought to me in three days,” said the Prince. I am sure this was not mere talk, for I heard it confirmed by enemies as well as friends of the Montenegrins. I was frequently told of a traveller who left his tent, with the door open, on a Montenegrin hill-side, and returned after three years’ absence to find every single thing as he had left it. It is the old story of the devotion of a simple-minded people, and the just administration of a Homeric chieftain—all the more easily carried out in such a country as the Tzernagora, because the Prince can be acquainted with the people as individuals, and can set them a personal example, eagerly caught up by each of his loving subjects.’²

¹ Sir Gardner Wilkinson, *Dalmatia and Montenegro*, vol. i. p. 481. *Travels in South Slavonic Countries*, p. 601.

² *Eastern Shores of the Adriatic*, p. 159.

Be the reasons what they may, we add our testimony to the honesty of the Montenegrin people. One use made of the little plane-tree in the centre of Cettigne is that of a deposit for found goods. Travellers in this country are as yet few, but if one chanced to drop an article on the road and it was found by any one in Montenegro, he might reckon on finding it laid at the root of this tree, or dangling from its branches, to be reclaimed by its owner. Few crimes blacken the simple annals of these highlanders, and, save for border feuds and forays, now, however, rare, there would occur nothing to disturb the quiet of the Black Mountains except actual hostilities with the Turks, or the expectation of approaching invasion. During the first five years of the reign of the present Prince, three executions occurred within the Principality, and when it is borne in mind that Prince Nicholas succeeded to power after the assassination of his predecessor at Cattaro; that vendetta had always been the practice, but had been only two or three years before made punishable by death; and that recent legislation had placed the murder of a Turk on the same footing as that of a Christian; and this in the teeth of invariable practice and of honoured tradition, not easily forgotten, the criminal business of the Principality must be acknowledged light. This state of absolute security upon the frontiers has not, indeed, been attained without the exercise of a determined will. During one progress of the Vladika Peter II. (1830-1851), he is recorded to have left fifteen culprits for execution. This, however, is a state of things which has passed away.

Such disputes as arise among so primitive a people are settled by the judges of the village, or the *sirdar* of the district. The senators are the chief judges of all matters which arise within their own districts, and the assembled senate is the ultimate court of appeal from that of the *palica* or district. In more difficult disputes the decision of the senate is given by the mouth of the president. The Prince, however, is commonly appealed to to settle disputes, and his decision is sought, not only by his own subjects, but by the inhabitants of the Herzegovina, which, though once part of Montenegro, has for a long time belonged to Turkey. 'Every peasant in the land, however poor, has a right to come to the Prince himself for judgment; and such is their affection for him that no one would dream of questioning his justice. If their sentence appears unjust, they say, "he has a reason for it," and acquiesce quietly. They are satisfied with the decisions of the senate only as believing them to come from the Prince

himself.¹ A recent traveller thus describes the court of justice at Cettigne :

‘In speaking of the metropolis I must not leave unnoticed the senate-house and senators of the Principality. Although for the trial of offenders charged with great crimes the senators meet within doors and have the assistance of a secretary to make a record of the cause, yet in ordinary cases this is not resorted to. The senate-house is, as the Prince’s secretary jocosely remarked, the largest in Europe, and indeed in the world. All ordinary assemblies, whether for council or the trial of civil and criminal causes, are held under the plane-tree in front of the palace, the heavens its roof and the horizon its boundaries. The Sunday evening after my arrival, I strolled out of my lodgings about six o’clock, and found a court of justice then sitting. The Prince was seated on a low wooden stool under the shade of the tree, whilst around him were ranged all the senators who happened to be in Cettigne. A few attendants with their rifles stood outside the circle of the senators, intermingled with a group of listeners, amongst the most interested of whom I may reckon myself. In the middle of the circle stood the plaintiff and defendant. The case was a disputed debt of a few piastres. Both spoke at once, and their pleadings were racy enough to elicit a joke or two from the Prince, and laughter from the spectators. In the midst of the examination of the parties to the suit—the only witnesses on this occasion—horses were brought for the use of the Prince in his customary afternoon’s ride. Thereupon he summed up and gave judgment, apparently to the satisfaction of both parties, though evidently more to the satisfaction of one than of the other ; since, though both came forward and kissed his hand, the successful suitor kissed the hem of his coat also. It was a very patriarchal scene, and such as might have been witnessed in the Highlands of Scotland little more than a century ago. The Prince told me afterwards that only trifling causes were thus disposed of, such in fact as required less the discrimination of a judge than the intervention of an arbitrator.’

The principles of equity, common to all people, the traditional laws of the old Servian monarchy, especially some precepts attributed to Stephen Dushan, made up until almost our own time the common law of Montenegro, and this unwritten code was the only law known throughout the Principality. At the close of the last century, however, Peter I. issued a code of thirty-three articles. These were republished with additions, extending the code to ninety-three articles, in 1856, by Prince Danilo. A few of these will give the reader some idea of the spirit which regulates the lives and actions of the Montenegrin people. It contains simple laws to restrain murder, acts of violence, the *vendetta* formerly practised, and robbery. It provides for the appointment of judges,

¹ *Eastern Shores of the Adriatic*, p. 157-8.

defines their qualifications, and prescribes the punishment for unjust judgments. Since judges are chosen by the people, one of the articles of the code declares it their duty to fulfil the obligations imposed upon them by this choice, and to labour to maintain peace among their fellow-countrymen. For this end the judges are forbidden to engage in traffic or to travel out of their country. On taking their seat for the trial of any cause they are to remember : 1. That by the voice of God and the will of the people they have been chosen judges, the fathers and lovers of their country. 2. They are to pray God to enlighten their minds and give them intelligence to discern the right and wrong of the matter before them. 3. They are to remember their oaths to act impartially and decide with equity without regard to the position of either party in the suit. 4. They are to hear each party, and not allow both to speak at the same time, but are to require them to speak without passion and slowly, so that the clerk may take notes of their evidence, and the judges may understand the grounds of their complaint or defence. Should a judge ask or receive a gift, he is to be degraded from his office. The judge who insults either party in a suit is to pay a fine to the Treasury, whilst an insult offered to a judge is punished by a like fine, and the imprisonment of the guilty party. Theft of cattle—oxen or horses—belonging to natives of Montenegro and the Berda, whether living there or in Austrian territory, is to be punished as murder, and that because 'he who steals the ox or horse of another causes more sorrow and tears to the whole family than if he had killed one of its members, especially if the owner be poor, and has no other ox or horse, for then being unable to buy another he would be compelled to sell his land or other goods in order to buy those animals, without which he could not live.' If a man wishes to sell his real property—his house, fields, or vineyard—he must first offer it to his relatives; if these are unwilling to purchase, he must offer it to his nearest neighbours, and only on their refusal can he put it up to public sale; the relatives or the neighbours are, however, not to take advantage of this law to the detriment of the seller. If they purchase they are to do so at the price others are willing to give, since it is to be offered at a fixed valuation. As markets are instituted for the good of the people, no one must disturb the peace at such places 'any more than they would quarrel in a church,' and those who commence or excite disturbances in either market or church are to be similarly punished. Injury to the person is assessed according to the

members injured, and the aggressor is required in addition to pay all costs incurred in the cure of the wounded man. A blow by hand, foot, or pipe, may be avenged by killing the aggressor, but if the injured person allows a day or two to elapse and then kills his opponent, he is guilty of murder. All brigandage on the Turkish frontier is forbidden in time of peace or during a truce, and in case of breach of this law, the booty is to be restored and the criminal punished. The son or daughter who treats either parent with disrespect is for the first offence to be fined, for the second to be imprisoned or flogged, for the third to be turned out of the house and forfeit all the rights of a child. That these laws may be observed throughout Montenegro, it is enjoined upon all priests, as well as upon the chiefs of each district, to call upon all heads of families to obey the laws, for which purpose they are to be at church on holy days. 'Since the law is made to prevent crime, it is necessary that it should be read by every one, so that none may plead ignorance in excuse for breaking it.' By the last article of the code of Peter I. it is declared to be the duty of every Montenegrin to be faithful to his country, from which no prosperity should separate him, and nothing should induce him to change his religion or betray or in any way be unfaithful to his brethren or his nation; for the lawgiver goes on to say, 'we are all bound to these conditions, since we are born and have been brought up in one country.'

Every Montenegrin is equal in the eyes of the law; all are regarded as noble; all possess property in land; all are eligible for the few offices which exist in the Principality; there is no standing army, whilst all bear arms, and almost all are skilled in their use. Where these conditions exist, it matters little what the form of government is: the result must needs be a free constitution. The technical terms of Western constitutional law are hardly applicable to Montenegro or Servia. In both countries we have the full tide of democratic liberty controlled by that idea which is at the root of all Slavonic institutions, the sacredness of the family tie. To the Montenegrin the Prince is the father of the country and of every individual within its limits; his orders are obeyed as dutiful children obey the commands of a father; his wish is law, as the wishes of a parent are regarded by dutiful children.

The land of Montenegro is divided into two classes, arable and grazing: the former possessed by individuals, or more usually by families; the latter the common possession of the people of the district in which it is situated. There

are no state domains in the Principality, and the largest landed proprietor holds but sixty acres. The other possessions range from freehold estates of two acres up to the modest dimensions of twenty acres. Although the arable lands are held usually by a family, not by an individual, yet each member of a family has the right, after conference with the rest, to separate his own share from the family estate, and to sell or mortgage his possession to his relatives, and on their refusal to purchase, to others. Up to the present time the practice has been for sons to reside with their parents, and cultivate the family land in common, and on the death of the father, to till the soil and share the proceeds in partnership (*sadruga*). This primitive and patriarchal system has, however, been of late years frequently departed from. When lands are shared, each son has a right to an equal part, as well as of moveable property, and no distinction is made between the elder and the younger son. It is the custom, however, to give the rifle, knife, and pistols of the father to the eldest son. If there are sons the daughters have no share either in the landed or moveable property of the family, though each of them receives at her marriage a portion of linen, dresses, and personal ornaments. When a man, however, dies without sons, the daughters inherit his land and other possessions, with the exception of the house and garden around it, and also of his arms, which become the property of his brothers or their sons. This is in the case of several daughters surviving. When there is one daughter, she usually, with the consent of her relatives, brings as her dower the whole of her father's property, of whatever kind it may be.

As to the grazing lands and woods, these are the property, not of individuals, but of the community or clan (*pleme*) settled on them. All houses or families belonging to this clan have equal right to pasture their cattle on these lands, and also to cut what wood they may require. This common right and a common church are the only ties which unite the whole clan, as there are no municipalities. In Montenegro every one is included in the *pleme* where he resides.

In every *pleme*, clan, or district, there is one *voyvoda* and one governor. The dignity of *voyvoda* and of civil governor is sometimes united in the same person. More commonly the *voyvoda* is of one family and the governor of another. The *voyvoda* is the military leader of the *pleme*. His office is hereditary, descending from the father to the eldest son.

When a *vojvoda* dies without sons, this dignity passes to the brother, nephew, or cousin, who is the oldest male in the family, and remains in his hands until a like failure of direct descendants takes place. Every *pleme* has, in addition to the *vojvoda*, a deputy *sirdar*, a dignity formerly hereditary, but latterly it has been conferred by the Prince according to his pleasure. The administration of justice and the civil government of the *pleme* is usually entrusted to one who, though chosen by the Prince, has been marked out for office by the confidence of the clan to which he belongs, and is consequently, unlike that of *vojvoda*, not an hereditary office. These two, the military leader and the civil governor of each *pleme*, assemble at Cettigne and compose the senate of sixteen—or, with the president and vice-president, eighteen members, the standing council of the Prince. These senators reside for three months in the year by turns at Cettigne, in lodgings provided at the public expense, and receive as an *honorarium*, rather than a stipend, a sum varying from 200 to 400 florins yearly, according to their needs. The president of the senate, who is the most considerable of the civil subjects of the Prince, receives an annual income of 1,200 florins, and the vice-president 1,000 florins; the secretary of the Prince, who is also 'clerk of parliament' to the senate, receives 800 florins. These senators, like the Conscript Fathers of Rome, are not only leaders in war, but also guide the plough, or more frequently handle the spade, and reap the harvests of their paternal fields.

The income and expenditure of the government of Montenegro are, we need not say, arranged on a most economical scale. The most considerable item in the receipts consists of an annual sum of 10,000 sequins, or almost 47,000 florins, paid by Russia as an indemnity for losses, and in acknowledgment of services rendered by Montenegro in the war of the French Revolution. To this has of late years been added an annual gift from France of 50,000 francs.¹ The family or house tax brings into the treasury about 35,000 florins; *ad-valorem* duties of four per cent. on all articles exported and imported produce about 25,000 florins. A tax of one *zanzig* (*4d.*) on every plough land (*kalo*);² five kreutzers on each hive of bees; three on each vine; two on every sheep; ten on every cow; together with the *appalto* of tobacco; a tithe of the fishery on the Rjeka; and the rent of certain convent lands let to

¹ Ubicini.

² This tax was formerly two zanzigs, but it has been recently reduced one-half.

peasants, make up a sum reaching to about 220,000 florins, 25,000*l.* English money.

The chief items of expenditure are the very moderate expenses of the palace; the cost of the printing-office, small gratuities to the Prince's guards; payments to senators, to the small body of artillerymen who compose the nucleus of the army, and to the masters of schools established by the present Prince and his predecessors. Add to this, in times of want—and times of want are frequent in those sterile domains—the purse of the Prince is the common fund to which all resort. For what is the Prince but the father of the country; and to whom have children, when in need, a better right to apply than to their father?

Ecclesiastically, Montenegro is a portion of the Eastern Church, and is governed by an Archbishop, who, however, as is not unusual in this part of the Church, has no suffragan.¹ Until the flight of the Patriarch of Ipek in 1769, the Montenegrin prelate was under his jurisdiction, but from that date has been independent of any superior, except in reference to the spiritual deference due to the Patriarch of Constantinople. Next in rank to the Archbishop are the Archimandrites of Cetigne and Ostrog. Scattered over the country are ten monasteries, several of great antiquity, but almost all inconsiderable as regards the number of their inmates. Throughout the whole of Montenegro, probably, there are not twenty monks, and some monasteries are ruled and served by one priest, who is at once *hegumen* and simple monk, the governor and the body governed. The parochial clergy are about 220 in number. The churches, however, exceed the number of priests, and several, built as votive offerings, or within reach of few persons, are served by the same pastor. Though in most countries the fact that the parochial clergy work like the rest of the inhabitants with spade and hoe, go armed with pistols and rifles, and are the captains of their parishioners in time of war, would prove injurious to their spiritual influence, even if it did not deteriorate their character, the Montenegrin priests, according to the testimony of most travellers, are respected by, and are deserving of the respect of their flocks. Poverty and their semi-military duties have, however, led to much neglect of ecclesiastical proprieties, and, except from his beard, and not always from that, it is often difficult to distinguish the priest from the lay people of his parish. This, however, is being remedied: the great ecclesiastical movement of our day has not been without influence

¹ Codinus, *Notitiæ Græcorum Episcopatumum*.

in these distant regions. The cassock is being resumed by the parochial as well as by the monastic clergy; and the observances of the ecclesiastical state are more cared for than was the case for many years. Baptism is now, according to the custom in countries inhabited by the Greek race, at least occasionally administered by immersion. As yet, however, this is but of rare occurrence; the almost universal practice being that of trine aspersion. A few years ago the writer was informed by Prince Nicholas that he believed his own daughter—he had then but one—was the only child within the bounds of Montenegro who had been baptized by immersion. Communion, again, are rare, and the sacrament of the Lord's Supper is scarcely ever received except on the eve of a journey, or at long intervals, on one of the greater feast days of the year.

Until the time of the Vladika Peter II., the only semblance of instruction for children was that afforded by the monks or clergy, who received two or three youths to assist in the cultivation of their fields, to wait upon them in their houses, and in the performance of clerical duties. These boys received in return sufficient education to enable them to read the Church service. These servitors were ordained when of age, and became parish priests. Occasionally a Montenegrin youth, better educated in the schools of Servia and Dalmatia, returned to his native country, and was ordained to the charge of a parish, or entered the ranks of the monastic clergy. This, however, was of infrequent occurrence, and the main body of the clergy had only such an imperfect education as they had obtained whilst acting as servants to the small monasteries. As to the people, in the spirit of Goldsmith's Dutch Professor, they were content to know that they tilled their ground without book-learning, and could fulfil the duties of soldiers and subjects of the Vladika without reading or writing. Now, however, the traveller as he passes through the country may see the youthful shepherd or goatherd sheltering himself from the rays of the noonday sun, under the shadow of a tree or of a rock, or at his cottage door when the day's work is at an end, poring over a New Testament or a volume of Servian poetry, or absorbed in the study of the songs which preserve with more fidelity than poetry the heroic history of their country. At the death of Peter II. in 1851 the only school which existed in the Principality was an elementary one at Cettigne, established by him in 1832, and this only accommodated eighteen or twenty scholars, whose instruction was limited to reading

and writing. A few years ago there were only eight or ten boys' schools in Montenegro, and also a small theological seminary at Cettigne, where youths, destined for the ecclesiastical life, as parish priests or as schoolmasters, were trained. Now they are more numerous, and the enlargement of the course of instruction has kept pace with the increase in the numbers of the schools. At Cettigne some of the scholars are maintained as boarders, in part at the expense of the Prince. The course of instruction, extending over four years, includes reading, writing, arithmetic, ecclesiastical music, the rudiments of geography, and sacred and profane history. As to the national history, that is taught by the songs, which all learn, whether they can read or not. Practically, at the present time, education is compulsory throughout Montenegro. Until recently, though the boys could receive a sufficient education in Montenegro, there were no schools for girls. This, however, has been remedied by Prince Nicholas, who has established a school at Cettigne for the daughters of what, for want of a better term, we may call the upper classes. This school will accommodate forty pupils. It is superintended by an accomplished Russian lady, assisted by efficient governesses. The charge is what we should consider small, only 20*l.* per annum. But then money is scarce in Montenegro, and this represents a much larger sum than it would in England.

But we must not linger over the social state of the Principality and its growth in civilisation. We cannot close this article, however, without a few words, brief though they must be, as to the history of the people.

In ancient times Montenegro was comprised in Illyricum, and its history must be sought in that of the province of which it was a portion. It was included in the district of Labeates, of which Skodra, the Albanian Scutari, was the capital. After the defeat of Gentius in 168 B.C., it remained for awhile independent, but was united to the Roman Empire by Augustus. On the division of the Empire into East and West, Montenegro with the rest of Illyricum was for a time reckoned in the Eastern Empire, but from the time of Honorius to the days of Augustulus it was a part of the Western Empire. Overrun by the Goths in their devastation of Dalmatia, Montenegro fell, in the ninth century, into the hands of the Slaves, and comprised a portion of the kingdom which had Dioclea on the Moratcha for its capital. After the fall of this kingdom it became an integral part of the Servian monarchy, which, in addition to the modern Principality of the same name, con-

tained Bosnia, most of Bulgaria, Dalmatia, and Slavonia, and extended in the days of Stephen Dushan to the Balkan and the coast of the Archipelago, and from the Black Sea to the Adriatic.

Montenegro, or the provinces of the Upper Zeta, as the Principality was called, embraced within its limits the present country of Herzegovina, and to the south extended to Skodra, on the southern shore of the lake of the same name. It was governed by a Ban or viceroy. The mountain principality, however, with its harbours on the Adriatic, was of such consequence that Dioclea, its capital, was from time to time the residence of the Kings of Servia. This city, the birthplace of Diocletian, was the seat of an Archbishop, within whose jurisdiction Montenegro was situate, and here, in 1199, an important synod for the correction of practical abuses in the Church was held. At present few remains of the city exist, except the lofty wall which surrounded it, some turrets, and fragments of sculpture and pottery. It is tenanted by a few peasants. The church-yard of an adjoining village, however, is white with tombstones of purest marble, slices of fluted columns, portions of rich friezes, and elaborate pagan altars overturned, whilst patches of Roman roads, and the remains of two or three noble bridges, prove the existence of a considerable population on the southern border of Montenegro in the time of the Empire. Podgoritz, on the Turkish side of the frontier, has scarcely a house in which the traveller will not find fragments of Latin and Greek inscriptions built into the walls.

At the date of the invasion of Servia by the Turkish army under Amurath, the lord of Montenegro was George Balsha, who, when the disastrous result of the battle of Kossova was known, retired from the field, and prepared to defend the province which he governed. Montenegro now became the asylum of those Servians who preferred exile from their country to submission to the yoke of the Ottomans, and many of the noblest families of the kingdom sought a refuge amidst its almost inaccessible rocks. This fact, were there no other provocation, would have sufficed to direct the attention of the conquerors to this fragment of the subjugated state, and the first Turkish invasion of Montenegro soon followed. In 1394 Balsha was compelled to solicit assistance from the Venetians, and to purchase it by the surrender of Durazzo and Skodra to the Republic. The defeat and capture of Bajazet by Timour, in 1402, arrested, however, the Turkish armies, and did more to save Montenegro than the arms of Venice. On the death of

Balsha, his nephew, Stephen, succeeded as ruler of Montenegro, which, though contracted, still comprehended, in addition to the territories known at present by this name, the strip of land interposed between the western border of the Lake Skodra and the Adriatic. As Skodra had been ceded to the Venetians, Stephen fortified Jablack, on the north-eastern side of the lake, and made it his capital. At this time Montenegro, from which the Herzegovina had been torn, seemed sinking like the surrounding States into vassalage to the Ottoman. The Albanian war, however, and the heroic exploits of George Castriotes or Scanderbeg, awoke the slumbering spirit of Prince and people. Stephen, who had married the daughter of Castriotes, joined the army of the Albanian hero, and by his side shared in the dangers of the long campaign. He lies buried in one of the islets on the Lake of Skodra. His son Ivan the Black, at first in conjunction with his brother George, and after his death, alone, governed Montenegro. Finding Jablack no longer tenable, this Prince burnt it, and took refuge in Cettigne, which from that moment has remained the capital of Montenegro and the residence of its Princes. In 1490, on the death of Ivan, he was succeeded by his eldest surviving son George. This Prince devoted himself to the intellectual improvement of his subjects. Almost before any other European sovereign had interested himself in the advancement of popular education, George IV. of Montenegro exerted himself in the erection of schools throughout his rugged Principality. Having procured types from Venice, he established a printing press at Rjeka, and the first copies of the Slavonic Liturgy issued from the press in this village.

George V., of Montenegro, in 1516, abandoned his sterile home, and took up his abode, first at Venice, and afterwards at Constantinople, where his family apostatised from Christianity. For more than a century and a half from his abdication, the history of Montenegro, though full of romantic incidents, presents little of public interest. The Bishop, who had been constituted regent during the absence of the Prince, became naturally, and almost necessarily, the ruler of the country. It is true that the civil and military functions of administration were devolved upon a lay governor; his power, however, was subordinate to that of the Bishop, and became little more than nominal after the dignity of Vladika was made hereditary in the family of Petrovich, at the beginning of the last century. In 1697, Daniel, of this family, was elected Vladika, an office which he held for forty years. At his death in 1737, his nephew was elected by the Skoupchina, or general assembly of the people,

and for seven generations the same precedent has been followed. Of the two immediate successors of Daniel, Sava and Vassili, we have no space to speak. Vassili, however, was succeeded in 1782 by one of the most remarkable and able rulers by which any country has been governed. Peter, the first Vladika of that name, had been chosen in the lifetime of his uncle as his coadjutor, and upon his death was immediately proclaimed Vladika. He recovered the districts known as the Berda, which had previously belonged to Montenegro, but had for some time past made part of the Turkish Pashalic of Skodra. In a succession of battles he so far broke the power of the Albanians, that the Principality was freed from the periodical invasions to which it had been subject ; and to quote the words used by his people, 'the land had rest for forty years.' A man of iron will, of dauntless bravery, he possessed great eloquence, and his energy in war and activity in the government of his country were contrasted by the gentleness of his disposition. In his personal habits he was simple and austere, so much so that in his last illness he had not even a fire within the four bare walls which served for his bed-room. The code of laws by which Montenegro is governed were issued by him, and the potato, which forms a large item in the exports of the country, and adds greatly to the means of sustenance of the Montenegrin peasants, was introduced by him. These acts, and an annual holiday, in which people flock from the whole of central Zeta, Herzegovina, and the Albanian plains as far as Skodra, preserve the memory of the great Prince Bishop, lawgiver, and saint of Montenegro. His immediate successor, Peter II., died on S. Luke's day, 1851, having by his will recommended or nominated Danilo, the youngest son of his brother Stanko, as his successor. After some attempt to dispute the will of the late Vladika, which the loyalty of the people frustrated, Danilo was acknowledged as the ruler of Montenegro. His youth—he was then about twenty-three years of age—was one of the reasons urged against his succession. He soon, however, showed tokens of a maturity of judgment beyond his years. His earliest efforts were directed towards obtaining a separation of the ecclesiastical from the civil functions of the ruler. Having first secured the concurrence of the people to the change of government, he made his way to St. Petersburg, and obtained the acquiescence of the Emperor. On his return, after a visit to France, he married a young Serb lady of Trieste—Darinka, the daughter of the President of the Board of Trade in that city—a wife in every way worthy of the Prince. His short rule of nine years was marked

by great advance in education and in social and political culture : an improved code of laws was promulgated, the people were induced to forego cherished national customs at variance with modern civilisation ; prisoners of war were no longer put to death ; the practice of cutting off the heads of dead foes, and preserving them as trophies, was discontinued, and raids upon the Turkish frontier were punished as crimes. In 1860 the Prince, while on a visit to Cattaro, and on Austrian ground, was assassinated by a Montenegrin exile, when his widow, the Princess Darinka,—passing over any possible claims of her only child, a daughter—proclaimed Nicholas Petrovich, the son of Mirko, elder brother of the murdered Prince, as his successor. Mirko had thus been destined to see his own birth-claims postponed in 1851 to the intellectual claims of his younger brother ; and, in 1860, saw himself again passed over, and his son selected to be the ruler of Montenegro. On both occasions he appears to have acquiesced loyally in the choice by which he was thrust aside. Only this acquiescence preserved peace to Montenegro. No one within its bounds was more popular or calculated to secure the popular suffrage than Mirko. A fiery Paladin, the very beau-ideal of Montenegrin chivalry, he was the trusted leader in every campaign ; and his presence secured victory to the troops whom he commanded. His deeds of bravery sound more like those of Homeric heroes than of a nineteenth-century soldier. His exploit at Ostrog, when, with twenty-six men, he held the hermitage against a Turkish army, and, when provisions failed, withdrew with the loss of one man, reads like a tale of romance. His victories carry us back to the days of Montrose, or of Charles Edward. Yet he was not a mere fiery chieftain. His experiments in rice and coffee, and labours to render the rocks around Rjeka productive, give us a picture of a scientific agriculturist. A volume of his poems now before us shows that the gift of song, hereditary in his family, was cultivated by him with success. The abnegation of such a man was remarkable, more remarkable indeed than his military skill, sagacity, and ‘ fierce courage.’

Of Prince Nicholas, a recent writer thus speaks :—

‘ In appearance the Prince is tall and remarkably handsome ; his hair is black, he wears both beard and moustaches, contrary to the fashion of his country, where only the latter are worn, often of immense size and length. With a commanding appearance, he still has a most benevolent expression of countenance, due to the softness of a very fine pair of eyes, and his manners are most captivating.

He is very dignified, but at the same time most kind, without being in the least patronising; and I was told by those who know him best that he has a most equable temper, and that an angry word seldom was heard from him.¹

Add to this, however brave and skilful in war, his tastes are those of peace. His delight is in his schools and his farm, in his collection of antiquities, and his study. Like his predecessor, he belongs to the class of 'royal and noble authors,' and his songs circulate from the northern extremity of Herzegovina to Skodra. Over this tract of country he rules, if not by right of territory, yet by the gifts of personal influence, over hearts if not over lands. To him disputants in the Herzegovina submit their differences. In him the hopes of the inhabitants of the whole of the Zeta yet centre, and his people obey him implicitly as they would obey a father whom they love. Such a Prince is worthy of a larger sphere of usefulness, and if his life be spared amid the dangers of the battle-field, this part of Turkey may yet find in Prince Nicholas Petrovich one who is able to heal its wounds, and restore to it its long-forgotten peace and prosperity.

ART. VIII.—INCREASE OF THE EPISCOPATE.

Report upon Increase of Episcopate. (Additional Home Bishoprics Fund.)

THE fact that, pending the Orders in Council which are to constitute the sees of St. Albans and Truro, the prorogation of 1876 has not left England and Wales augmented by even a single additional diocese beyond the number existing when Henry VIII. died, is one which may well provoke disquieting thoughts. To be sure, our generation has seen a Bishop of Ripon and a Bishop of Manchester added to the Bench, but in 1546 the diocesans of Gloucester and of Bristol were separate persons, and Westminster was a bishop's see. Yet the last half century, which at home has done so little for the institution which is, as all orthodox teachers will tell us, the very keystone of the spiritual polity, has been in the best sense revolutionary as to every other feature of the Church system, while it has called into being, almost out of nothing, all through the colonies and dependencies of the British

¹ *Rambles in Istria, &c.*, p. 225.

Crown, a wide-spread, numerous, and constantly increasing Episcopate. In approaching the question of the increase of the Episcopate, we are bound to ask, in the first place, why this should be so, and as we are not writing for rhetorical effect, we shall discard the trick of setting up a series of supposititious reasons merely to knock them down again.

This one drawback to what is otherwise an advance 'along the whole line' of the Church, both as an organisation and as a spiritual power, is, we believe, due to the connection of Church and State—that is, to the Church of England being an establishment, and to the bishops being lords of Parliament no less than ecclesiastical rulers. We make this assertion thus downrightly, first, because, being true, it ought to be owned; and, secondly, because raising, as it does, first principles, it could not be ignored without involving the equivocator in a tangle of inconsistencies. The inference which we are *not* going to draw from our premiss is, that this connection of Church and State ought therefore to be put an end to. No such alliance can be one of unmixed good or unmixed mischief. Having pointed to a very undeniable mischief growing out of it, we must record our unhesitating conviction that the benefits to which it has given birth far outnumber the evils which can be credited to it. In more precise language, we believe that if the revolutionary tendencies fostered by the first Reform Bill had gained strength enough to disestablish the Church, we might perhaps (for at best it is but a perhaps) have had more bishops, though the sum total of their flocks would certainly have been much smaller; but in all which affects a people's inner and better life, the Church and the State of England would have been immeasurably in a worse condition than that in which they now find themselves. The Oxford movement might have gone on, but it would have differentiated a sect in place of modifying a nation.

It is well to have clear views upon this primary question at a time when the increase of the Episcopate within the lines of the existing relations of Church and State has become not only a practical and an immediate question, but one in which a definite progress has already been consummated under conditions involving consequent and continuous advance, at the peril (if it be checked) of discontent and confusion. It can no longer be asked whether the increase is possible or desirable, or, assuming it to be both, in what shape it ought to be proposed. The former question has been answered in the affirmative by general consent, and the specific scheme of the Government has not only been shadowed out in Mr. Cross's

speeches, but exists upon the Statute Book as partially embodied in the St. Albans and Truro Acts. In short, the practical inquiry of the day has become, How far does that scheme deserve the approbation of Churchmen? At such a conjuncture it would be equally unwise and undefensible to meet a plan which has gone too far for fundamental alteration, but not far enough to be incapable of amelioration, either with unqualified praise or with remorseless criticism.

We do not think that we misrepresent Mr. Cross's idea if we describe it as one to augment the Episcopate of England and Wales with a 'moderate' addition (taken out of the most heavily weighted sees) to its number of bishops whose status and average area of diocese shall be identical with that of the existing body, and their incomes able to bear an approximate comparison with those of their older brethren (who, for their part, shall not be allowed to tax themselves below a point at which the virtual continuity of that status stands safe); while the system of rising by rotation to a seat in the House of Lords, struck out when the see of Manchester was made, shall continue without any consequent increase of the Spiritual Lords of Parliament. Mr. Cross not only provides for a specified cathedral, but recognises the existence of a dean and chapter as in theory the fitting complement of a fully organised diocese. At the same time, as we shall have to show, he has manifested singular timidity in giving practical effect to this view in the two Acts which he has passed.

This is in itself a consistent scheme, whether or not it be the one best adapted for its object, compared with other proposals for augmenting the Episcopate which have been made by persons of influence at various stages of the Church revival. A passing reference may suffice for Sir William Palmer's sanguine day-dream that the Archbishops should become Patriarchs, and the Bishops Archbishops, while the land was to be filled with a multitude of small sees. Mr. Newman was more moderate and practical when, as far back as 1835, he published a touching and forcible appeal for more bishops, culminating in the suggestion of meeting the want by reviving the office of 'suffragans' (more correctly 'coadjutors') as constituted by 26 Henry VIII. c. 16. Men at that time received so bold a proposal with a stare of astonishment; but what was once Mr. Newman's strange aggressive plan is actually the existing order of things, not only in the persons of the formal suffragans of Nottingham, Dover, and Guildford, but in the emeriti bishops from the Colonies, who are able as archdeacons or 'commissaries' to give their

services to various dioceses. The present cry for an increase of the Episcopate is, in short, an onward step beyond the mere provision of more bishops in the shape of suffragans, formal or virtual. These have been tried, and while they have unmistakeably proved themselves helpful, the experiment has convinced impartial observers that something further is wanted, and that that want is the reduction of the more unwieldy dioceses by the creation of fresh sees, each see involving the constitutional organisation which has of old attached to the English as to other branches of the Catholic Church.

The cause of the increase of the Episcopate has, during the few last years, been intimately associated with the honoured and lamented name of the late Lord Lyttelton. We shall, accordingly, take up the history at the date when he came conspicuously on the scene, merely reminding a later generation that a formal scheme for such increase had been propounded about thirty years ago by a small Commission over which the late Lord Powis presided, after his patriotic perseverance had succeeded in preserving the two sees of North Wales, which resulted, under the minimising influence of the then Prime Minister, Lord John Russell, in the foundation of the single see of Manchester; and that another scheme was a few years later submitted by that Cathedral Commission, which owes its origin to Mr. Walpole, when he was Home Secretary during the first Derby Government. About this time, also, a plan for legalising the voluntary endowment of bishoprics, of which Mr. Gladstone was author, appeared on the notice paper of the House of Commons.

Those who take a superficial view of the incidents which mark the movement might imagine that the policy of which Lord Lyttelton was advocate differed essentially from that which the Home Secretary has taken up. To us the difference seems rather one of circumstance than of principle. Lord Lyttelton, when he first undertook the charge of the question, wisely elected to act in concert with the Society for the Increase of the Home Episcopate, of which he was the main-spring and second founder. The movement in its later phase had, in 1867, sufficiently ripened to justify legislative action, and so Lord Lyttelton brought in a modest Bill for the prospective erection by private munificence of only three new sees, St. Albans and Truro—which have since been created by separate Acts—and Southwell, for the relief of the dioceses of Lincoln and Lichfield. This was an obviously tentative measure, and, as it did not contemplate any relief to the large towns which have grown up

in the Province of York, it left one great source of contingent munificence quite untapped. As a pilot balloon, however, it may have been well devised, and the process of its introduction was judicious. A Conservative Ministry was then in office, although only existing on sufferance, and opposed to a hostile majority in the House of Commons; while the conduct of the Bill in both Houses devolved upon Liberals who were conspicuous for their attachment to the Church—Lord Lyttelton and Sir Roundell Palmer. Accordingly, its course was prosperous, and the majorities in both branches of the legislature which sent it on its way were conclusive that at that date more bishops would be acceptable to the Church and people of England. At length, at its very last stage, it fell through, owing to influences the recollection of which it is not necessary to revive.

After this check the attention of Lord Lyttelton was for a while devoted to that revival of the office of suffragan bishops of which we have already recorded the relative success. At length the occasion recurred for more direct operations, and in 1871 Lord Lyttelton issued a carefully worded circular to the existing Episcopate, consulting them (with a not too ostentatious *præjudicium* hinted) as to the resumption of the campaign. The answers came in as desired; and the next move was to draw up a memorial to Convocation, which was presented by the present Bishop of Winchester (then of Ely) to the Upper House, with the result of a Committee being appointed to consider its prayer, while the Lower House unanimously adopted a resolution in its favour, praying the Upper House to consider what steps should be taken to effect the desired object. This proceeding was followed up, at the end of 1872, by a short paper of queries from Lord Lyttelton to all the Rural Deaneries, which was so successful that, out of 450 Deaneries, 441 returned an affirmative answer to the first and most important question, pointing to 'a division of some of the larger sees into two or more independent sees.' In the meanwhile the Committee of the Upper House of Convocation, of which Bishop Wilberforce (then of Winchester) was chairman, had drawn up a Report, of which we quote the most important passages:—

'We deem it impossible to determine *à priori* how many new bishoprics ought to be erected in England and Wales.

'The erection of new sees must depend on local circumstances, and, as the law now stands, be effected by separate Acts of Parliament. This we think undesirable, and concur in the recommendation of the Cathedral Commissioners of 1852, that a general enabling

Act of Legislature should be obtained, empowering the Queen in Council, through a scheme to be proposed by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, with the consent of the bishop, to form a new see by the division of any existing diocese; the scheme for carrying this into effect being in each case laid on the table of both Houses of Parliament for a certain period, and, if no address against the same be carried in either House of Parliament, to become law.

‘One important practical question with reference to the creation of new sees is, How are endowments to be provided for them?’

‘We do not recommend applying to this purpose any of the large funds derivable from the Episcopal estates in the hands of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, which, through their ‘common fund,’ are now employed in raising the incomes of the parochial clergy, and in the relief of the spiritual destitution of populous places.

‘It was suggested by the Cathedral Commissioners that in certain dioceses the office of the dean might be held by the bishop, and thus the income of certain deaneries might be made available for the foundation of new sees. By this plan, no doubt, funds might be obtained for the foundation of some bishoprics. As to this proposal, we abstain from expressing an opinion.

‘But, as to the remainder of the capitular property, we cannot recommend its application to this object. We think it inexpedient further to reduce the small resources now remaining in the National Church for the support and encouragement of a learned clergy.

‘We cannot therefore find in the present revenues of the Church the means for providing the necessary endowments for new Episcopal sees.

‘We are of opinion that, where these are required, funds will be provided by the members of the Church, if the necessary facilities are given for the foundation of new sees by the passing of such an enabling Act as we have recommended.’

We may call particular attention to the reference so cautiously given in this document to the suggestion of the Cathedral Commission of 1852 for allowing, in certain dioceses, the office of dean to be held by the bishop, so that the incomes of the respective deaneries might be made available for the foundation of new sees, accompanied by the direct dissent from any application towards the Episcopate of ‘the remainder of the capitular property;’ the whole summing up in the conclusion, that ‘we cannot therefore find in the present revenues of the Church the means for providing the necessary endowments for new Episcopal sees.’ In these days, when there may be a risk that in the new-born zeal for more bishops (in compliance with Sydney Smith’s whimsical precedent of the Synod which, considering the part which prelates played there, could not have been that of Dort), the *mensa* of the Chapters may be appropriated to furnish

out fresh sees, we press these wise cautions upon general attention. We cannot too emphatically repeat that while we want more bishops, we claim that they shall be constitutional bishops, acting with their Chapters, not despots and policemen.

This Report came in due course before the Upper House, and Bishop Wilberforce, on February 11, 1873, carried a resolution affirmative of the procedure therein recommended. This was a direct leading instruction to Lord Lyttelton and his Society, who accordingly placed in the hands of Mr. Robert Few and Mr. Walter Phillimore the drafting of a Bill upon the lines of the resolution of the Upper House. This empowered the Ecclesiastical Commissioners to draft schemes for the creation of new bishoprics, either by the division of single dioceses, or the union of portions of different dioceses, to take effect by consent of the actual holders, or on avoidance. These schemes were to comprise necessary details, such as boundaries, the existence of archdeaconries, and the designation of the cathedral, whether an actual church or one to be built, the amount of endowment, and the division of patronage. A special clause empowered the Commission, either in the original scheme or subsequently, to propose the creation of a dean and chapter, or of a chapter, and to provide for the appointment of a dean, canons residentiary and non-residentiary, and other officers, and to make the necessary statutes as to duties and residences. All such new bishops, deans, and canons were to be bodies corporate, as the actual dignitaries are, and to have the same powers and responsibilities. All schemes were to be submitted to the Queen in Council, and then to lie on the table of Parliament under the conditions now governing analogous schemes; no portion of the common fund of the Commission was to be used for endowments, nor was any scheme to be submitted till a sufficient endowment from private sources had been transferred to that body; the rotation system as to seats in the House of Lords was to be continued, and the number of Spiritual Lords was not to be increased, and, until there was a Chapter to elect, these new bishops were to be appointed by Letters Patent.

Armed with this Bill, Lord Lyttelton sent it with a commendatory circular to all the bishops, and only received two, or at most three, unfavourable replies. After all these preparations he was ready to have introduced it in the session of 1874, but the dissolution and change of Government led him to postpone it for another year, which he utilised by obtaining an expression of opinion favourable to an increase of the Episcopate from Mr. Disraeli.

At length, at the commencement of 1875, Lord Lyttelton introduced the Bill into the House of Lords, and succeeded in carrying it through all its stages without a division, and with only one amendment, and that an improvement, being a clause inserted by the Bishop of Exeter, enabling holders of existing sees to devote a portion of their income towards the new sees, by which they might be relieved. The Archbishop of Canterbury spoke decidedly in favour of the measure, and the good-will of the Government found its expression by the mouth of Lord Salisbury. An amendment, proposed by Lord Cottesloe, to schedule the places where new sees might be established, met with no favour from the Treasury Bench, and was dropped, after Lord Cairns had expressed his disapprobation. The only adverse incident was one to which we are peculiarly unwilling to refer, for reasons which we need hardly explain; but which, affecting as it did the future progress of the measure, can hardly be passed over. We mean the injudicious expression of disappointment which, at its last stage, its noble author dropped at the assumed failure of support on the part of a Government which had just been giving to his Bill the peculiarly practical help of pushing it through with no delay, and in the shape which he preferred. No one, we suppose, who listened to this scene with surprise and regret, had any suspicion that physical ill-health lay at the bottom of the too evident depression of spirits manifested at the very instant of success. The immediate result was of course to complicate the action of those who desired to carry it through the House of Commons, and who felt that in doing so they were, on the one hand, bound to disconnect themselves from those heedless words, and, on the other, not to distress or repudiate their noble-hearted speaker. Another complication also presented itself. The Government was at the moment offering its own instalment of Episcopal increase in its Bill for the creation of the see of St. Albans, due to the generosity of Bishop Harold Browne of Winchester; and it would obviously have been a narrow and hardly generous policy to have treated this measure as a rival or hostile one. Physically no doubt it could not help standing somewhat in the way of a larger Bill of the same class in charge of private Members. Much as these persons were interested in Lord Lyttelton's Bill, they were so because it was a contribution to the increase of the Episcopate; on the other hand, they were not interested in the increase of the Episcopate merely as the pretext for enabling them to connect their own names with the Statute Book; hence their only course was loyally to

accept the intimation, and show by deed as well as word that they wished to facilitate rather than thwart the passing of the St. Albans Bill. Accordingly, with the double motive of giving the latter Bill a good start, and of letting the memory of the scene in the House of Lords be forgotten, Mr. Beresford Hope (who had at Lord Lyttelton's personal request undertaken the conduct of the measure) waited his opportunity for moving the second reading till the St. Albans Bill was safe on its way to becoming a statute. We shall have some things to say of this measure, but as they are not essential to the present history, and as we can introduce them in connexion with the Truro Act, or with the *précis* of desirable new sees which we shall offer, we postpone any further reference to the still inchoate Bishopric of St. Albans.

At last Mr. Beresford Hope found the way open to move the second reading of the Bill on Friday, May 28. Sir William Harcourt met the motion that the Bill be read a second time with an amendment to read it a second time on that day three months. It was strongly supported by Mr. Hardy from the Treasury Bench, and a division might have been taken on the main question. But the small minority of its opponents resisted it with successive motions of adjournment, and, although they were beaten by 101 to 42, 92 to 37, and 86 to 36, the majority had, as always happens in such cases, to succumb to obstinacy and late hours. The numbers on the divisions were, however, conclusive as to the opinion of the House on the question itself. A few days later, at a quiet moment, the second reading was taken without a division; but the stages of committee, with possibly the consequent report (a merely nominal stage when a Bill is lucky enough to get through committee unamended), and of third reading had yet to be faced, and forms of the House—which, in spite of possible vexatious applications, are of great general use in checking headstrong or sleepy legislation—came to the aid of Mr. Dillwyn, the veteran foe of Episcopacy. The Bill never even got into committee, but it never disappeared from the Order Book till the absolute close of the session. Indeed, the two last divisions of the session were in reference to it, and were taken on Monday, Aug. 9. The mover proposed to take the committee on the following Wednesday, namely, within what were known to be the intended limits of the session, on which Sir Charles Dilke moved to substitute 'Monday,' a day outside of the session. He was beaten by 50 to 27, and the Speaker ruled that no other substitute day could be proposed. Yet the opponents of the Bill

divided again upon the main question, and were again beaten by 53 to 24. This last division, so forced by them, became (although they may not at the time have perceived it), by the forms of the House, a direct 'aye' and 'noe' division upon the Bill itself. Thus the session of 1875 closed its contentious existence in directly affirming by more than two to one the principle of Lord Lyttelton's Bill. A considerable number of members of the Government voted in favour of the Bill in the five divisions to which it gave occasion, including three members of the Cabinet, of whom Sir Stafford Northcote and Mr. Hardy voted every time, and Mr. Hunt in the two last divisions, which also reckoned the Attorney-General (Sir R. Baggallay), while the Solicitor-General (Sir J. Holker) voted on all five occasions. No single member of the Government recorded his vote the other way.

In the meanwhile the Statute Book had been augmented by the still unfortunately inoperative St. Albans Bishopric Act, of which we shall have to speak further on. Mr. Beresford Hope undertook to introduce his Bill in the next session, promising Lord Lyttelton to bring it in exactly as it stood. Considering the support which it had received from Lords and Commons, Bishops and Ministers, as well as the fact that it had been built upon lines laid down by Convocation, it would have been abandoning a great advantage to have done otherwise. At the same time he reserved for himself full discretion as to accepting or rejecting amendments on future stages. As the session of 1876 drew near, several perhaps rather perplexing phenomena manifested themselves. It was a very encouraging symptom that many of the principal Church Societies, the National and Christian Knowledge Societies, the Propagation of the Gospel, the Church Building, and the Additional Curates (stimulated by energetic influence strong in the last-named body), as well as the Church Defence Institution, combined with the Home Episcopate Society in favour of a pronouncement which culminated in calling a Conference, to be held some two days after the meeting of Parliament, at the National Society, with the Archbishop of Canterbury in the chair. On the other hand, there were rumours in the air that the support, not very active indeed, but, as far as it went, unconditioned, which the Government had given to Lord Lyttelton's Bill in the preceding session, could not be again relied on.

Parliament was duly opened, and Mr. Beresford Hope, taking his chance in the rush of private Members struggling to push their Bills, was fortunate enough to secure the earliest

available Wednesday, February 16, for his second reading. In the meantime the Conference was held in the National Society's room, and was attended by an influential representation of Churchmen. The Archbishop of Canterbury, who presided, hardly utilised the enthusiasm which had been raised upon the question, when he multiplied his cautions against too extensive a demand, and proposed in effect to limit the active work of the day to starting a subscription for filling up the gap still yawning for the endowment of the see of St. Albans. He made a still more conspicuous mistake when he quoted the unlucky project of confiscating the ancient see of Sodor and Man towards a bishopric of Liverpool, which was so well able to provide for itself, as a contribution towards the increase of the Episcopate. The shower of protests from all parts of the room which this suggestion elicited showed how unpopular it was among those whose good opinion was essential for the success of the work. At length the conversation was brought to a practical result by a proposal of Mr. Philip Cazenove to appoint a Committee for collecting subscriptions in aid of the general augmentation of the Episcopate. The body so started was the nucleus of the Society which has since come into prominence as 'The Increase of the Home Episcopate Fund.' Small at first, it recruited its ranks from clergy (exclusive of bishops) and laity, until it became a very representative phalanx; while, in reviewing its contingent duties, it repudiated the merely mechanical rôle of a solely begging body, and claimed the more responsible work of carrying out a discriminative policy. It had thus occupied the ground of the old Society, but in no spirit of hostility; for among its most active promoters were found the principal members of the older body. The chairmanship was unanimously assigned to Lord Lyttelton (at the time out of England), and the formal fusion of the two Societies followed as a matter of course; while, on one occasion, before the dark day which deprived the Church of England of one of its noblest and truest sons, the chairman took his seat at its consultations. Here, however, we must revert to the Parliamentary fortunes of the Episcopate question.

In opposition to the second reading of Lord Lyttelton's Bill stood three amendments: two of direct rejection; the third, in the name of Sir Walter Barttelot, being the 'previous question,' which, by Parliamentary conventionalism, implies a declaration that the motion is inopportune, without any necessary censure upon its subject matter. This (though not first in order) was allowed priority. The

mover recapitulated the reasons which had weighed with him to bring in the Bill in the precise form in which it had been the last question to engage the session of 1875, as it was the first to arrest the attention of that of 1876; showing that in any other form it could not have claimed the weighty consensus of previous support, on which he dared again to recommend its acceptance. He admitted the criticism that such a measure would more appropriately have been introduced by the executive, but he urged that, as the Government would not take it up, private Members were well justified in so doing. He combated the charge of vagueness freely brought against it, showing that that epithet might far more appropriately be applied to the charge itself. Besides, a measure which should be declaratory and not permissive was hardly within the competence of an irresponsible Member. Moreover, it ought to count for something that the Bill was drawn in exact conformity with the recommendations of the Upper House of Convocation. At the same time he expressed his willingness to accept amendments in committee, and in particular he pointed out that limitations might be introduced to secure a minimum of area and of population both for the residuary and for the new dioceses. Sir Walter Barttelot, while strong in his resistance to such a question falling into the hands of private Members, disclaimed hostility on his own part to an extension of the Episcopate promoted by a responsible Government. After a debate, conspicuous both for copious criticism of the details of the measure and for a general consent in favour of some method of providing more bishops, Mr. Cross rose to express the views of the Government. These were, briefly, opposition to the Bill on account of its 'vagueness,' combined with a constructive promise of a 'well-considered' scheme for a 'moderate' increase of the Episcopate. In face of such a declaration it was clearly Mr. Beresford Hope's duty not to force the House to a division upon his Bill, which would, while inevitably wrecking it, have seemed to imply distrust of Mr. Cross's intentions, and thereby forfeited the influence with the Government which a more friendly attitude on his part would have created. On the other hand, to have allowed Sir Walter Barttelot's 'previous question' to be carried would have been misunderstood out of doors, and been taken by persons unversed in Parliamentary refinements as the abandonment of a trust. A friendly motion by Mr. Hall for the adjournment of the debate solved the difficulty. Mr. Beresford Hope at once expressed his acquiescence in the adjournment,

and implied, that in so doing he virtually left the further prosecution of the question to its legitimate promoters, the Government. At the same time he took pains to call attention to the language used by the Home Secretary as implying a measure which should provide for the creation of several sees, and not a series of single measures on the plan of the St. Albans Act. On the Opposition showing some unwillingness to accede to the arrangement, Mr. Disraeli supported it, and all seemed to portend an unanimous acquiescence—which would have been a very satisfactory solution—when Mr. Dillwyn's wrong-headed obstinacy brought about an even better result. He challenged a division in the interest of his unmitigated hostility to any measure having for its end more bishops. Mr. Hall's motion at once assumed a new character, and those who voted for it voted in favour of more bishops *simpliciter*, those who supported Mr. Dillwyn declaring for no more bishops. The House, thus polled, showed an overwhelming majority for the former opinion, while the list presented the Ministry and the leaders of the Opposition, Sir Walter Barttelot and Mr. Beresford Hope walking into the same lobby.

We have at this point to ask ourselves if the conduct of Mr. Cross, in regard to Lord Lyttelton's Bill, was justifiable. On the several occasions upon which it was debated and voted upon in the House of Commons, during the session of 1875, the Home Secretary never spoke or gave a vote, while his colleagues went on committing themselves and the Government to its support. In 1876 he suddenly unmasked a battery against it, and placed it under the Ministerial ban, not for its intention but for the machinery by which that intention was to be compassed. Writing neither as partisans of Lord Lyttelton's nor of Mr. Cross's policy, but in the interest of the acquisition of more home bishops, we believe that the impartial verdict would be that Mr. Cross was tactically justifiable, but logically unjustifiable. We make this assertion on the assumption, which nothing has led us to doubt, that Mr. Cross is not only personally favourable to an increase of the Episcopate, but desirous of marking his tenure of the Home Office as the era of such increase. When a Minister has resolved upon a policy, and sees his way to the process by which he intends to carry it out, he is by the laws of political strategy justified in suppressing counter-projects for the same object adventured by private and non-responsible Members. But the ostensible reasons which he offers for such suppression may be logical or illogical; and the arguments by which

the Home Secretary invited the House of Commons not to give a second reading to the Bill appear to us to have been weak and inconclusive, except so far as they were endowed with the factitious strength belonging to the assertions of a Minister who is sure of the majority behind him.

The arraignment of the Bill was, in fact, nothing more than a dexterous counterchange between the statement that it was permissive, which was true, and the accusation that it was vague, which was a very different assertion. It shared the quality of being permissive with that series of Church-building Acts which have, between 1818 and the present day, transfigured the English Church. If it was no blame in a statute to be a self-acting machinery for creating undefined parishes with unnamed vicars, we cannot see the harm in one which included similar powers of evolving undefined sees presided over by unnamed bishops. But probably this spongy epithet of depreciation was a random way of hinting at certain supposed risks which might have been serious had they not been impossible. The opponents of the Bill were fond of harping on the risk of the Church being swamped by a multitude of little sees inadequately endowed, as if the clauses did not absolutely bristle with safeguards against any such risk—(1) the prohibition forbidding the Ecclesiastical Commission to accept an insufficient endowment, (2) the control of the Queen in Council (or, in other words, of the Ministry), and (3) the critical 'lying on the table' of both Houses. Then it was contended that the Ecclesiastical Commission was hardly a body to be trusted with such high powers as adding a bishop to the Church, with his consequent, though deferred, seat in the Upper House. This might have been true if the powers of the Ecclesiastical Commission in the matter had been anything more than negative. The motor under the Bill would have been the donor of the endowment, and the Commission could hardly go wrong with *Kratos* and *Bia* sitting upon it in the shape of Ministry and Parliament. Still the Bill had to be cleared away, and in fault of better arguments, these served well enough the purpose of brooms, although the truth should have been owned, that any scheme for constituting specific sees, which Mr. Cross or any other Minister might favour, could have had form and shape given to it with perfect convenience under the provisions of Lord Lyttelton's Bill. It was, on the other hand, as undoubted that a private Member's Bill, such as this one, could most modestly and appropriately take a permissive shape, as indicative of principles to be worked out by the executive. But behind all these

rather unreal criticisms of Mr. Cross, we believe that a feeling or prejudice ambuscaded, that, for so big a creation as a new see with its Lord Bishop, no process less solemn than an Act of Parliament ought to be thought of. At last, after almost a session had elapsed, July 5, to which the debate had been adjourned, came round; and Mr. Beresford Hope, in withdrawing it, repeated his appeal to Mr. Cross to act up to the conditional promise of February. The Minister, in his reply, approached still more closely to a positive assurance than he had done on the former occasion. He was emphatic in his recognition of the unanimity which the House showed in declaring the necessity for more bishops, which he said was almost greater than he had ever seen on any other question. If rumour speaks truly, any difficulties which may have hitherto delayed the production of a definite scheme were not of the Home Secretary's suggesting.

In the meanwhile the session had, like the preceding one, not been wholly barren as to this particular question. Among the parts of the country which by general consent were most in need of a special episcopal supervision, Cornwall—itself eighty miles long—stood prominent, both geographically as a member of the huge and inconveniently shaped diocese of Exeter, which was already fully weighted with the county of Devon (the third in size in England, and not much smaller than Lincolnshire), and socially from the vigour with which Dissent had been taking advantage of the feebleness of the Church in the extreme west to press its own claims upon popular acceptance.

About thirty years ago Dr. Walker offered to Lord Powis's Commission to found a see of Cornwall, on condition that the cathedral town should be St. Columb Major, of which he was patron and incumbent, and from the endowment of which the income would partly have been derived. The authorities of those days began looking the gift-horse in the mouth, and the opportunity slipped by. Still the destitution of Cornwall continued to make itself felt, and Bishop Phillpotts, with the munificence which belonged to him, and for which he has received scant credit, left his theological library to Truro, as the commencement of an ecclesiastical establishment in that town. Bishop Phillpotts never wavered in his support of the necessity of a bishopric of Cornwall, and his legacy may be taken as showing his opinion as to the place most suited to become the see town. Bodmin is now county town, and it possesses the largest still complete church in Cornwall. But in all social and commercial as-

pects, as well as in facility of communication, Truro is the more important place. Besides these, there is no other choice. St. Columb was one man's fancy, and that old seat of a bishop, St. Germans, is as ill fitted to be the ecclesiastical capital as Launceston was to be the civil one when the Judges held the assizes there, because it was the first place they could reach from the rest of England, little heeding that for the same reason it was the most inconvenient for the whole county.

The recrudescence of the Episcopate movement was felt as soon in the south-west corner of the country as in other districts, and it took shape about at the same time that a see of St. Albans was becoming a proximate possibility, from the concurrence of two exceptionally generous offers. A benefactor—long anonymous, but who has lately stood confessed as Lady Rolle, a resident in Devonshire, and therefore conspicuously public-spirited—offered an endowment of 1,200*l.* a year, with the intimation that if the see were not founded during her lifetime, it must lapse; and the Bishop of Exeter expressed his willingness to appropriate 800*l.* a year from the income of his see, which stood at the maximum figure of 5,000*l.* per annum. Here were 2,000*l.* a year ready to hand; but Mr. Cross at first stipulated for the production of an annual endowment of 3,000*l.* as the condition antecedent to legislation. A brisk canvass for subscriptions was undertaken both in and out of the diocese, with the result of producing a considerable sum, but still one which fell short of the Minister's requirement.

The risk, however, of the great gift unhappily lapsing dissuaded from further delay, and as the state of the subscription did not justify him in adhering to his conditions in all their rigour, Mr. Cross brought in a Bill upon the 8th of last June, providing that, when the Ecclesiastical Commissioners should certify that the net income of the Truro Bishopric Endowment Fund, of which they were to be trustees, was not less than 3,000*l.* a year, or that it was not less than 2,500*l.* a year, with contributions guaranteed which would raise it to 3,000*l.* in five years, the Queen might by Order in Council found a bishopric of Truro, consisting of the archdeaconry of Cornwall, or such part thereof as might to Her Majesty seem meet, with St. Mary's Church at Truro as cathedral, 'but subject to the rights of the patron and incumbent of such church,' and may declare the time at which such Order is to come into operation. The Home Secretary, in the short speech with which he introduced this measure, referred to the

virtual engagement which he had made to legislate by some Bill laying down a general plan of episcopal extension, and pointed to the risk of the promised benefaction to the Cornish see lapsing, if in this instance he were to be bound to a literal compliance with the policy which he had announced. This explanation was heartily accepted as satisfactory, even by those who felt most strongly upon the undesirableness of piecemeal legislation, and the Bill, after weathering a farcical opposition from Mr. Dillwyn and Mr. Biggar, passed absolutely unchanged through the House of Commons; while, as might be supposed, it did not even meet with the shadow of criticism in the Upper House.

While we congratulate the Church upon the successful course of legislation which has in two sessions endowed it with a couple of much-needed sees, we must guard ourselves from the risk of being supposed to be entirely satisfied with either statute. The great blot alike upon the St. Albans and upon the Truro Act is that neither of them contains any provisions for the creation of a Chapter, and that, in consequence, the recognition of the constitutional regimen of episcopacy is very inadequate, while each leaves the appointment of the bishop, pending the deficiency, to the direct nomination of the Crown under Letters Patent, as 'in the case of a bishopric where a dean and chapter have not proceeded to elect a bishop in accordance with the licence and letters missive of Her Majesty.' But on the foundation of such dean and chapter, 'a vacancy in the Bishopric of Truro shall be filled in the same manner as a vacancy in any other bishopric in England.' Very inconsistently with this omission to make any prospective arrangements for the foundation of a chapter, the Act, in its very next clause (7), gives the Ecclesiastical Commission powers to lay a scheme before the Queen both for assigning to the Bishop of Truro 'all or any such courts, officers, and jurisdiction belonging to any bishop in England, and not otherwise assigned by this Act or any Order in Council made thereunder, as may be thought expedient to assign,' for 'the creation and endowment of new archdeaconries,' for 'founding honorary canonries in the Cathedral Church of Truro,' and for providing that 'any non-residentary canons in the Cathedral Church of Exeter who, upon the foundation of the bishopric of Truro, may be holding benefices in the diocese of Truro, and'—out of some spirit of incomprehensible eccentricity—'consent to the transfer, shall be transferred to, and become honorary canons in, the Cathedral Church of Truro, instead of being non-residentary canons in

the Cathedral Church of Exeter.' During the transitionary condition of matters, the Church of St. Mary, Truro, will be a cathedral only in name; the incumbent, and of course the churchwardens, retaining their rights, and the honorary canons having no apparent powers of entry. We do not blame this—until it becomes a real cathedral it must be retained as a real parish church—but we remonstrate against the delay in the organisation. One may well ask, in bewilderment, why the Act should thus be freighted with all its complicated provisions for making or transferring the *disjecta membra* of what might, even as they stood in the measure, be collected up into a chapter, and yet should so ingeniously avoid declaring them to be such corporation. These 'honorary canons,' even unrecruited by any of those prebendaries of Exeter—who one should hardly think would exchange their ancient statutable and substantial offices in a typical cathedral of the old foundation for the colourless position of an 'honorary canon' of Truro—could, under the presidency of the archdeacon, have been declared a chapter for the discharge of the easy duties of electing a bishop. We are tempted to add that it looks like carelessness or wilfulness in the framers of the Act to have dubbed them 'honorary' rather than 'non-residential' canons. But this consideration is immaterial compared with the more important one which the deficiencies of the measure irresistibly suggest. To pass Bills containing prospective machinery for creating fresh bishoprics, and then to quail before the gigantic task of importing into them prospective provisions for strengthening those bishops with deans and canons, is indeed straining at the gnat when the camel has been swallowed. This inconsistency puzzles us, on the part of a Minister who has in other matters shown himself both bold and consistent. There is another supposition to which we can only refer to scout it, namely, that Sir William Harcourt was too much for the Government. No doubt that jurist never loses the opportunity, when any reference is made to deans and chapters, to level at them one of his heavy sneers, and to prophesy that the man will never be found who could think of endowing such an institution. But it would be a wild surmise to suppose that the learned gentleman's Rhodian eloquence had cowed the Treasury Bench. It may be asked why, with this defect on the face of the Bill, no Churchman had endeavoured to set it right during the progress of the measure. We suppose the answer will be, that as the Government unmistakeably showed that it based its hopes of passing the Bill in so crowded and backward a

session on abstinence from debate, Churchmen thought upon the whole that the solid benefit involved in its main provisions justified them in agreeing in what they could not approve. This was more easy for them to do because the Bill, while omitting to provide for the creation of a dean and chapter, did certainly point to their ultimate existence as the perfect form of the diocesan system, and was, so far as theory went, a witness in the right direction.

We have spoken thus strongly upon a patent shortcoming in the two Acts with a practical object. These Acts, we suppose, will be the model of the more extensive one which is all but promised for next session, and accordingly the silent acceptance of any defect occurring in them would be an inducement to the draftsmen of 1877 to repeat the mistake. It only requires the slight resolution of determining to disregard the thunders of Sir William Harcourt, Mr. Dillwyn, and Mr. Biggar, to overcome any difficulties which may be in the way of a future Bill prospectively and potentially endowing the new bishops, whoever they may be, with their legitimate staff and council, the dean and chapter. It would be not only wilfully to forego an opportunity, but laboriously to create difficulties in the future, if the Government were again to neglect provisions so obvious.

We are aware that there are Churchmen in the country whose estimate of such enactments is modified by a conscientious repugnance to the colourable election of the royal nominee under the so-called *congé*, as in itself odious if not blasphemous. Those who take this opinion are of course bound to agitate for change. For our own part, however, we must confess that, while fully alive to the unreality of the election, and with the indignation still warm with which long years past our own ears heard an equally-divided Court of Queen's Bench declare the procedure at Bow Church to be a dead formality—and conscious as we are that some living power of resisting an improper nomination ought to be restored to the election and to the confirmation—we yet regard it as a form which testifies to a principle which may bear fruit some day. We are, at all events, certain that the most likely way of our reinvesting the Church with a real voice in its choice of its chief pastors is not to take away the traditionary, though it may be now otiose, recognition of the right. England, happily, while it can create, is fonder of revising.

In the meanwhile the shape in which the choice of bishops could be put upon a basis, which should be at once more popular and also more ecclesiastical than it is at present, is not

so simple a question. The primitive system of a joint election of the clergy and the faithful presupposes a constituency of the really 'faithful,' which the long-established abeyance of coercive discipline has indeed left it difficult to compass. Election either by clergy, or by a mixed lay and clerical constituency, is now to be found in Churches which are in communion with that of England. But no one who has scanned the ecclesiastical history of the last thirty years can say that this system has shown itself free from difficulty, or even from scandal. No one, on the other hand, who looks back to the list of Minister-made bishops during that period, can shut his eyes to the eminent services, the deep learning, the self-sacrifice, which that system has elicited. The nominating Minister is, at all events, though by indirect suffrage, the mouthpiece of the people; and in any choice which he makes he acts under a maximum of responsibility, such as few local and limited electoral bodies can feel. A Prime Minister may have his bias, so may also the magnate on either side of the Atlantic, mitred or unmitred, who pulls the wires of the little synod or of the body of approving bishops; but the one is likely to hear of it in a very different way from the other. On the whole, then, we doubt the policy of vaguely agitating for a change in the system of electing bishops, unaccompanied by specific suggestions for giving some practical shape to that change. On this head we feel it to be our duty very emphatically to press counsels of caution upon sanguine friends with whose intentions we have the deepest sympathy. Episcopacy as a principle is more directly, and at the same time more delicately and more embarrassingly mixed up with the actual divisions within our Church than it was with those of other times and countries. Catholics and Donatists, Catholics and Arians, Catholics and Nestorians, Catholics and Eutychians agreed, speaking generally, about Apostolic succession, Sacraments, and Liturgical worship. Councils, heretical no less than orthodox, appealed to and were therefore a witness for Episcopacy. Now the bitterest internal controversies are raging over the closely allied questions of Sacramental virtue, the Grace of Holy Orders, and the relations of worship to doctrine. At such a crisis of opinion suddenly and largely to alter in a popular direction the process of choosing bishops, not under the irresistible pressure of external circumstances, as in the Colonies (not to come nearer home), but out of deliberate choice, and so as to involve condemnation of the discarded system, would be to put human nature to a severe strain. The man must be truly

high-minded who could resist all temptation to use his influence in the episcopal election for the purpose of strengthening his particular convictions. With the same temptation working upon many minds in various directions, the election must inevitably risk being a trial of sectarian strength, in which the interest of party rather than the personal fitness of the candidate would bias the votes. The present system does not exclude strong partisans from the bench, but in any diocese the other side is only disappointed, not beaten; and the bishop only knows who do, and who do not, agree with him, not those who strove to put him in and those who strove to keep him out of his sacred office.

We must now turn our attention to what has been doing outside of Parliament in the matter of more bishops. Rumours of confidential deliberations between personages in high social stations, and of not quite unanimous conclusions, were rife when the Committee of the Home Episcopate Fund, taking the larger view of its duties, resolved upon consulting its own experience, and publishing on its own responsibility some practical scheme for the desired end. It was, in the existing condition of things, unanimous upon one point, that no suggestion had any chance of being even looked at which contemplated a radical change in the actual ecclesiastical and social status of the Episcopate in its spiritual and its political aspects. Keeping this guiding principle in view, it was clear that the minimum number of new sees which could be created under those conditions, so as to supply the existing want, would leave the sum total at about thirty-five, and the maximum staff which would rectify the existing inequality, without creating another inequality downwards—always supposing the co-operation of a fairly Chancellor of the Exchequer—was about forty dioceses. With forty bishoprics, London might still continue the smallest in area, while none need have so small a population as now attaches to Hereford; and the Parliamentary rotation would still remain a working system. On the other hand, however, it was abundantly clear that a present demand to raise the number of sees to forty would simply frighten the actual Government and the higher prelacy as well, and thus hamper rather than help the movement, while a smaller addition would, as far as it went, be a great gain. Animated by such instinctive perceptions (for they were too practical to begin working by hard and fast rules), the Committee began by indulging its own sense of proportion by drawing out a scheme which represented the ideal forty, and then reducing the list on special and local considerations till it

had worked it down to a number which had a fair chance of winning favour in ministerial and archiepiscopal eyes.

We shall begin by explaining what the new sees are which the Committee recommended in its Report in the revised and reduced form in which that document was published, and then refer to other districts and places which might be included in a wider scheme.

The number of dioceses in England and Wales, when those of St. Albans and Truro are completely organised, will be twenty-nine; and to these the Committee propose to add six, three of them in either province. The Committee, in framing its suggestions, adopted as a leading principle the desirability of as far as possible bringing diocesan and county boundaries into harmony. It was plainly out of the question to make this an absolute law. The disparity of numbers between counties and dioceses, and the very unequal sizes of the shires, forbade it. Besides there might be local considerations of a social or physical character, which prompted a reconsideration of political divisions made very long ago. As to the general principle, however, it is a matter so plain as to require to be stated only, and not argued out, that all the feelings of that living loyalty and patriotism which men are apt to render to things not too large to be visibly grasped, and which they have long bestowed upon the county which they inhabit, and in which they are important—because working—citizens, are equally capable of being elicited for a diocese, whose area corresponded with the much emphasised limits of the political unit, with its quarter-sessions, its lord lieutenant and sheriff, its knights of the shire and its militia.

It stands to reason that Episcopacy must be a much more real thing in Sussex, which is also the exact diocese of Chichester, than in Shropshire, which is halved between foreign Lichfield and foreign Hereford, or Suffolk, which is equally the sport of distant Norwich and distant Ely. When diocesan synods and conferences have become as they ought to be, and as (God helping the Church of England) they will be, the rule in every diocese, the sight, wherever circumstances admit of it, of the bishop, supported by the lord lieutenant and the sheriff, would aptly typify that alliance of Church and State to which, as we began by saying, we do not shrink from avowing we attach peculiar importance, without caring to ask whether it is for England a happy accident, or an arrangement capable of technical defence. If it is only a happy accident, so is an hereditary Upper House of legislation. By the creation of the see of Cornwall

two counties and two dioceses will severally become identified. St. Albans will, on the other hand, take in two counties; but, as the entirety of each county will appertain to the new see, the co-ordination of ecclesiastical and of civil authority will still exist. As to the way in which these considerations have been lost sight of in the proposed reorganisation of Rochester, we shall have somewhat to say hereafter.

The choice of see town is another matter of considerable importance, on which we consider it impossible to lay down any one general rule. Among obvious constraining motives we may specify the presence of a large church to serve as cathedral, or of a large town as a centre of operations, and also a medium of influence, not forgetting also the importance of the bishop's residing in a central and accessible situation. Happy indeed is the case in which all considerations unite. We may generally say that the schemes of some twenty or thirty years back were rather more solicitous as to a sufficient cathedral than more modern reforms. It is well, therefore, not to risk running into an opposite extreme and overmuch neglect the necessity of material institutions. In the days which witnessed the creation of the sees of Ripon and Manchester, the choice no doubt was determined by the presence of the two collegiate churches, with their surviving chapters; though in the case of Manchester, the place itself had irresistible claims. In the new dioceses there could have been no doubt as to the see town for Herts and Essex being St. Albans. With such a church, and such a history to that church, and no really large town in either county, it would have been preposterous to have adopted any other conclusion. In Cornwall, on the other hand, as we have seen, the rather larger church of Bodmin (for that would not, as cathedrals go, have been a large one for such a dignity) has had to give place to the more active and bigger town of Truro. We will but point to the alternative, always in reserve in days when persons have learned to give, and art and architecture are in favour, of building a cathedral where the bishop is most wanted.

The most northern diocese, Durham, is also one of the largest in area, while its already vast population is continually growing as mineral wealth develops. Time was when, with all its historical dignity and solitary grandeur, the princely see, which represented on another site the mission-fold of the re-cluse Cuthbert, was a wild and sparsely-peopled tract of moor and mountain. Now, shorn as it is of so much worldly pomp, the diocese of Durham comprises the counties of Durham, with 647,592 acres, and a rapidly growing population

of 685,089 ;¹ and of Northumberland, with 1,290,312 acres, and 386,646 population. There can be no doubt that a see for Northumberland is very much needed, if only for the sake of Newcastle-upon-Tyne. The most direct confession of this want has been made since the recess, in the letter of the Bishop of Durham, munificently offering to surrender 1,500*l.* out of his income for the object. Only we trust that further funds will not be sought at the cost of the chapter of Durham. The demand for a bishopric of Newcastle, although allowed to sleep for generations, was in fact made in the very earliest days of the reformed Church ; for, as is fully explained in Dr. Lorimer's *Memoirs of Knox*, Somerset seriously contemplated forming a see of Newcastle, more, we fear, for the sake of doing a bad turn to the Bishop of Durham than with any more spiritual motive. Had he succeeded, it is very probable that the tutelary genius of Scotch Presbyterianism (himself in priest's orders, and who afterwards refused Rochester) might have become an English bishop. In our own days, when the foundation of the see of Manchester had called public attention to similar wants elsewhere, a public-spirited citizen of Newcastle, Sir John Fife, succeeded in raising much general sympathy for the foundation of a bishopric in that huge place. We now plead for the accomplishment of this too-long deferred project. It is true that the old-fashioned stagnant market-town of Hexham, the seat of a bishopric in pre-Norman days, still contains a stately minster of early pointed character, or at least its choir and transepts, and that the Commission of 1855 did recommend a bishop's throne to be placed in this venerable church. But, with Hexham, vegetating on the verge of the county, and with such a town as Newcastle, containing a population which the Registrar-General in 1875 computed at 137,665, standing on the main north line, and an excellent railway centre, there can be little doubt as to the choice. Fortunately this growing place contains the Church of St. Nicholas, well worthy by its size and character to become a cathedral.

Since the creation of the Bishopric of Ripon, Yorkshire is divided between two sees, with the enormous respective dimensions (including some small bits of adjacent counties) of York with 2,261,493 acres and 1,060,878 inhabitants, comprising the whole of the East, most of the North, and a

¹ When not otherwise noted, all the populations which we shall have to quote are from the census of 1871. A considerable margin will therefore have in most cases to be supplied for the five years' subsequent increase.

portion of the West Riding; and of Ripon, with 1,567,793 acres and a population of 1,357,053, formed out of the West Riding, with the addition of a portion of the North. These figures prove the necessity of at least one more see being formed; but they do not help us very much in deciding how the division should be made. A suggestion has been thrown out that Beverley Minster, in the East Riding, might become a cathedral; in which case, and supposing no further division, the Archbishop of York would naturally undertake the care of some additional part of the West Riding. But, on the whole, the most natural plan would be to form the new see out of Ripon, and to place it in one of the large woollen towns of the West Riding. Leeds, the largest of all, with, as computed in 1875, 285,118 inhabitants, and the ruins of Kirkstall Priory, so easy to be restored as the possible cathedral, lies somewhat near to Ripon itself, and might accordingly be objected to by those who are particularly interested in that see town; and Sheffield (in the York part of the West Riding), with, as the Registrar-General believes, 267,811 persons, stands away from the thickest hive of population, and is indeed the centre of an industry which has no connexion with that woollen trade which has enlarged and enriched the other towns. Bradford (computed at 168,305 inhabitants); Halifax, or Wakefield (containing 28,079 inhabitants), are also candidates, and one of the two last-named seems to be the most probable choice. Last year, indeed, on the vacancy of the living of Halifax (having by the last census a population of 65,518), a most energetic movement was set on foot to provide an endowment which, in combination with a certain sum deducted from the very large endowment of the vicarage, might yield a sufficient income for a bishop with his throne in the spacious old church. Promises came in, but not fast enough, a new vicar was appointed and the source of the vicarial income—always the topic of a popular agitation—passed under the scrutiny of a Committee of the House of Commons. A bishopric of Sheffield, on the other hand, would relieve, not Ripon, but the Archiepiscopal see of York. This might include Hull, with its 121,892 inhabitants, but as that port stands within a few miles of Beverley, it could be more readily administered from there; still, within the narrow limits of the present scheme, neither of these places comes forward with any very strong claim. Were such a larger project of episcopal extension as we have called attention to under deliberation, these respective wants and facilities would demand careful consideration.

It is probable, thanks to the enormous concentration of power to will and to execute resident in Liverpool, that the needs of Lancashire may be provided for previously to those of Yorkshire. This county contains 2,819,495 inhabitants, distributed over its 1,207,926 acres, and was, previously to the creation of the see of Manchester, dependent, in spite of its even then teeming population, upon the episcopal superintendence of external bishops, especially of the Bishop of Chester, itself a see of Henry VIII.'s erection. Even then Manchester no doubt owed its good fortune, as did Ripon, to the exceptional circumstance of possessing not only a large church, but also a living chapter, which resulted in the latter case in the bishop being placed in the town where he was particularly wanted. At all events, these arrangements were testimonies to the connexion of bishoprics and chapters. The present ecclesiastical distribution of Lancashire is that the northern extremity of the county belongs to the see of Carlisle (otherwise taking in Cumberland and Westmoreland), while Chester (besides Cheshire, with 705,493 acres and 561,201 inhabitants) owns the Hundred of West Derby, occupying the south-west corner of Lancashire and including Liverpool. The rest of Lancashire belongs to Manchester. It is clear that the diocese of Chester and county of Cheshire ought to be conterminous, and there can be no doubt that a new see should be created at Liverpool for at least the part of the county now belonging to Chester. The larger possible scheme might have sought a second new see at Preston or Lancaster. But we confine ourselves to arrangements contingent on the single new bishopric of Liverpool. Areas and population would be equalised by allowing this to borrow from Manchester up to and inclusive of Preston, with its population of 85,427, and by enlarging the borders of Carlisle. For Liverpool itself to find the funds necessary to endow its bishop is no difficulty, and a laudable readiness has been shown to forward the good work. As if, however, on purpose to thwart so felicitous an enterprise, some too ingenious person has started the idea of a short cut by suppressing or confiscating (we believe they call it uniting or absorbing) the ancient see of Sodor and Man. Happily the general feeling of indignation which this high-handed suggestion has aroused will, we believe, go far to render its accomplishment impossible. When, as we have noted, the Archbishop of Canterbury allowed himself, at the Conference of February, to refer to the notion in favourable terms, the response was one of universal disapproval. Those who hope

to carry out the spoliation rely, we believe, upon the well-known poverty of the clergy in the Isle of Man, and trust that they may be tempted by a promise of sharing the booty to acquiesce in what to a Manx man would be a national degradation. Those, however, who argue in this way press rather rapidly to by no means consecutive conclusions. It may be true that the Manx clergy are poor, and that the bishop has 2,500*l.* a year. But, even supposing that 1,000*l.* could be well diverted from this stipend towards enhancing the incomes of the incumbents, it does not at all follow that the best use of the remaining 1,500*l.* would be to pour it into the teeming lap of Liverpool. According to the scale of the island incomes, a resident bishop, on the footing of a Colonial prelate, could well maintain his position upon that stipend. As to the feelings of the islanders themselves, their legislature, the House of Keys, may well be taken to be a trustworthy as well as official exponent, and a debate in that House, in the course of last spring, commenced by the acting Speaker testifying with no uncertain sound as to the desire of the people to retain their historical bishopric. The leading paper of the island, although it represents Wesleyan views, was strong in its resistance to the abolition policy. Liverpool can abundantly afford a bishop of its own; let it do so, and general sympathy will accompany the undertaking. When the see has been created, the bishop will find himself destitute of any church fit to be his cathedral; but we trust and believe that the construction of an appropriate minster would be a point of urban honour to that great community which has created the Docks and built St. George's Hall.

In that larger scheme of new sees—upon the actual basis to which we feel it our duty to call attention from time to time, though the immediate attempt to develop it is at present premature—a second new see for Lancashire would, as we have noted, be well placed at Preston or at Lancaster. Preston is the larger place, Lancaster the historical capital of the county, and it possesses a fine church. Even in this case the mountainous tract beyond Morecambe Bay had better still belong to Carlisle.

We now pass into the Province of Canterbury, and find ourselves confronted at its northernmost verge by a group of populous and important counties, which had better be taken together. Lincolnshire, with 1,767,962 acres (the largest next to Yorkshire) and 436,599 inhabitants, with Nottinghamshire, comprising 526,176 acres and 319,758 inhabitants, makes up the actual see of Lincoln; the latter shire having, at the time

of changes (before which Lincoln reached to and included Hertfordshire), been transferred from the province and diocese of York. The adjacent diocese of Lichfield has 1,740,607 acres and 1,356,869 inhabitants, including Derbyshire with 656,243 acres and 379,394 inhabitants, and Staffordshire, with 732,434 acres and 858,326 inhabitants, as well as a portion of Shropshire; the remainder of that county making up, with Herefordshire, the diocese of Hereford, whose 986,244 acres only hold 237,138 people. It is obvious that all Shropshire must go to Hereford (so adding about 120,000 persons to it), and we are then left, according to the smaller scheme, to deal with the four counties, which would then, without further change, make up the two dioceses of Lincoln and Lichfield. We represent an unanimous feeling in postulating the creation of a fresh see within these limits. This see, by general agreement, must be placed somewhere in Nottinghamshire. The simplest process of division would be to leave to it only its own county. But a see for Nottinghamshire only would be less than a third of the size of Lincolnshire, although the greater density of its population (in which collieries abound) would leave it with more than three-quarters of the numbers of its big neighbour. To enrich Notts at the expense of Lincolnshire would be so far to level the acres, but, besides breaking up the unity of that county, it would be also to leave the Bishop of Lichfield with nearly 1,400,000 acres, and more than 1,200,000 inhabitants. The first impulse might be to throw all Derbyshire into the lot of Nottinghamshire, and thus make a new diocese of nearly 1,200,000 acres, containing more than 800,000 souls. A proceeding like this, however, would bear the stamp of what is in collegiate language called 'book-work.' Such a new diocese of Notts plus Derbyshire would not only be a creation, the unwieldy vastness of which would make the task of the first organising bishop very perplexing, but it would proceed upon a reckless disregard of marked physical characteristics. The northern portions both of Derbyshire and Staffordshire form a homogeneous district of a marked individuality, which distinguishes it from the southern parts of the two counties. This is called in Derbyshire the Peak, and in Staffordshire the Moorlands; and is, in fact (although the highest point just falls short of 2,000 feet above the sea), a mountain tract of considerable extent; the hills being partly of limestone and partly of sandstone formation. The population is sparse and primitive, and the parishes generally huge, although supplemented here and there with older chapelries and more modern district parishes,

the respective places of worship of either description being for the most part of the dreariest conventicle type. The olden churches—with a very few marked exceptions—are small and rude. Of the old uncouthness, or worse, of the peasant clergy, who tended this region not so long since, we could tell strange things, but we forbear. Now, here and there over this region, genuine church life is budding forth, amidst much discouragement, but it is still a tender plant; and, according as it is discreetly or roughly handled, it may or may not grow up into robust vigour. The one essential to its good success is the consciousness of corporate church life—the unity which a vigorous episcopate would confer in binding together the too much parted elements of a society which the physical difficulties of rough roads and long winters have so strong a tendency to sunder. But an arrangement of dioceses which should give all Derbyshire to one bishop and all Staffordshire to another would simply apply the knife to the tenderest part and cruelly vivisection the fragile frame. Throughout the district the county boundary follows the mid-channel of that little mountain stream the Dove, nowhere, till it emerges from the hills, more than some twenty feet broad, and parting the meadows of the same small farm, or the steep slopes and rocks of the narrow dale. The contemplated wrench would be fatal to struggling churchmanship in such a district, for neither of the bishops would find the material handy for a satisfactory work of missionary enterprise. Whatever distribution is made, all the Peak and Moorlands district must be under the same spiritual headship. Upon the whole, then, if it be decided that Nottinghamshire alone is not enough for the energies of a freshly-created prelate, we should advise its being augmented by the Parliamentary division of East Derbyshire, including Chesterfield and the Clay Cross collieries, and thus homogeneous with the coal-producing parts of Notts. The Bishop of Lichfield would then be left with all Staffordshire, and with North and South Derbyshire. In a further scheme another fresh diocese could well be formed out of the southernmost part of Staffordshire, picturesquely and appropriately known as the 'Black Country,' a land of coal and iron, grimy by day with perpetual cinder heaps, and at night illuminated by the glare of furnaces which cannot be counted, and containing such towns as Wolverhampton, estimated by the Registrar-General to have had, in 1875, 71,718 inhabitants; Walsall, with 49,018 in 1871; West Bromwich, with 47,918; Wednesbury, Bilton, Tipton, &c.; to which Dudley, though in a detached part of Worcester-

shire, might be thrown in, with its 43,782 inhabitants. The cathedral for this see is ready built; for Wolverhampton possesses a large and stately, once collegiate, church, of which, until the changes started in 1835, the Dean of Windsor was titular dean.

We have, in order not to deal at once with more than one class of difficulty, purposely postponed asking what should be the see town of Notts. The Home Bishopricks Fund's Committee's Report, to which we have so often to refer, says on this head:—

‘There can be no doubt as to the necessity of a see of Nottingham, with its see town at Nottingham or Southwell. The former is much the larger place, and has a well-built and handsome church. Southwell enjoys the ancient prestige of what has been a collegiate church since Saxon days, and can point to the existence there of an episcopal palace, and of buildings suitable for a chapter. On the whole, the Committee recommend that Nottingham should be made the see town.’

We have a great respect for that document, but we do not hold it to be infallible; and we think that this is a conclusion which does not absolutely conclude its controversy. Indeed the paragraph itself shows that reasons exist which might be urged for Southwell. The practical economy of utilising the buildings which not only exist at Southwell, but are (as being in the hands of the Ecclesiastical Commission) available, would, we believe, be considerable; and we understand that the Bishop of Lincoln holds decided opinions upon the question. Nottingham, no doubt, is a town which the Registrar-General in 1875 put at 92,251 inhabitants, but it lies in the south-western angle of its county, while the very much smaller town of Southwell is not only more central, but is so easily accessible to and from Nottingham, that, as Bradshaw informs us, five trains run daily in either direction between the places at an expense of time of from thirty-five to fifty-five minutes, so that a bishop living in the purer air of Southwell might be on the spot at Nottingham whenever he was wanted. These are, of course, considerations which would be of little moment if Southwell did not possess positive claims of its own. These may be summed up, in addition to the material ones which we have already pointed out, in its noble minster, which has been continuously a collegiate church from Saxon times, until late changes, in a mere spirit of prosaic and parsimonious uniformity, swept away its staff and reduced it to the ordinary parochial level. We admit that the question has two sides,

but we will not admit that the case of Nottingham *versus* Southwell is prejudged because in the case of Northumberland we preferred Newcastle to Hexham. Each such case must be decided on its own merits ; and there is nothing inconsistent in an impartial bystander contending that in the respective balances Newcastle might outweigh Hexham, and Southwell Nottingham. If Nottingham be taken, it can certainly offer a fine town church as cathedral, though one not to be thought of on any principle of comparison in conjunction with Southwell. It is one which, in its present condition of satisfactory restoration, exhibits the best side of our communion, and yet its fittings themselves tell a curious tale of the wide divisions which unhappily distract the fold. In the goodly chancel of St. Mary's, Nottingham, stand a set of stately stalls of rich third pointed design, but of modern workmanship. A few years ago the stalls there were of an identical design, but of genuine antiquity, carved out of dark ripe mediæval oak. Then came a vicar of the strictest sect of Low Church puritanism, to whom these stalls were an incumbrance or an abomination, and he cast them out into the churchyard. The authorities of a new little district church in the suburbs of the big town seized so golden an opportunity, and, obtaining possession of the treasure, re-erected it in their chancel. Better counsels in due time prevailed at St. Mary's, and its then representatives strove to recover their stalls. Sneinton was justifiably inexorable, and so St. Mary's had to be content with fac-similes.

We cannot pass on without adverting to another consideration which, according as it is viewed, may be taken as a reason for or against the selection of Nottingham. When Pius IX. contrived so egregiously to mismanage the perfectly legitimate (from his point of view) proceeding of introducing into England a territorial hierarchy, Nottingham was made the seat of one of the Roman Catholic bishops, and a large church by Pugin was declared to be his cathedral. No doubt the confusion, if there is any, already exists between this dignity and our suffragan Bishop of Nottingham ; but it would probably be greater if there were to be two Bishops of Nottingham, both resident, and both claiming to be diocesans. The other view, of course, is that the Roman usurpation calls for a material protest from the genuine Anglican Church, and that this is an additional argument for Nottingham. We only deal with the question as one of policy, and one in which the question of degree must hold an important part. No one would think the existence of a Roman Catholic

Bishop of Southwark any reason against an English see in that place.

The arrangements incident on the creation of the see which is next proposed are of a more simple description. The diocese of Worcester, speaking generally, is now composed of the county of Worcester, with 472,453 acres and 338,837 inhabitants, and of Warwickshire, with 566,458 acres and 634,189 inhabitants, as counted in 1871. It is clear that there must be a see in Warwickshire, and the only question is as to the see town. The choice lies between Birmingham and Coventry. Birmingham, which in 1875 was computed as containing 366,325 inhabitants, might seem to claim the preference. But Birmingham stands at the extreme corner of the county, while its known political and religious characteristics would not make it the most favourable centre for a bishop's operations, unless he were a man specially qualified for aggressive work. It might turn out a success, and if so, it would be a very great one. It is equally true that a merely moderate success would be almost equivalent to a conspicuous mistake. Moreover, the chances of success or mistake might be so even and uncertain that the most blameless or wise bishop might most innocently—and owing to influences external to himself—commit the latter, or, under identical circumstances, stumble on the former. The recognised presence, too, in Birmingham, with its scant respect for traditional dignities, of a Roman Catholic bishop and cathedral, has to be taken into account. Dr. Ullathorne and St. Chad's represent to the younger generation what they have always known as the bishop and cathedral of Birmingham, and the Anglican counterparts would for some time wear the aspect of new-comers. Besides which we possess no sufficient church there, so that, even on trade principles, the Anglican episcopate would necessitate the building of an Anglican cathedral, which should be conspicuously bigger and finer than Pugin's pile, or the move would simply result in a gratuitous exhibition of material inferiority. In short, a see of Birmingham includes immediate outlay, not only for men, but for building. Of course, if Birmingham, irrespective of mere bigness, were the more convenient spot, geographically or historically,—or if Coventry were, on similar grounds, unsuitable,—we should never think of urging such considerations of mere caution. But how does the case stand? There is little or no analogy between Birmingham and Leeds, or Manchester, or Liverpool. Each of the three last-named towns presents a huge modern outgrowth, but it is from a compact

historical nucleus, so that there is an urban unity to deal with; while Birmingham is a somewhat invertebrate aggregation of modern streets. Old Mercian Coventry, on the other hand, is not only in itself a large place, of 41,350 inhabitants, and one which stands centrally to its county, as it does proverbially to England itself, but it has, so to speak, a reversionary right to become the seat of a bishopric. It still enjoys the dignity of being a 'city,' in memory of its former cathedral and bishops. Till late changes, it belonged, together with Lichfield, to the see of Lichfield and Coventry; till the Restoration that see was entitled Coventry and Lichfield; and till the Reformation a cathedral stood in Coventry as stately as the one in Lichfield. This beautiful minster, crowned with its three spires, stood in the same churchyard as the two noble parish churches of S. Michael (in the patronage of the Crown) and Holy Trinity (in the patronage of the Lord Chancellor), each of which still upraises its conspicuous spire. The choice of the new cathedral of Coventry would lie between these two churches. The Bishop of Coventry would, of course, hold himself always in readiness to be at his post in Birmingham, in which (although not deriving his title from the place) he might be a frequent resident.

We have now reached the metropolitan counties, and we may as well begin with the county of Middlesex and diocese of London. The Committee discusses these in the following words:—

'Vast as the population of London is, and overwhelming as are its needs, your Committee are at present unable to make any other suggestion except that of confining it to the county of Middlesex, with a view to possible sub-division at some future period.'

This conclusion has been criticised, but we think that it can be well justified. Even if it were taken as a mere confession of inability, the moral courage which could own that it shrank before the great and delicate difficulties of such a problem as the spiritual superintendence of London, might well claim such credit as may be due to a proper distrust of self. But the considerations to which it points are not merely negative, for it recalls the small area, within which London is crammed, and the insignificance, as far as size goes, of Middlesex. Other new dioceses in various parts of England would involve an urban centre of activity with comparatively inert surroundings in the neighbouring country; and the see of Liverpool itself would be no exception to this rule. A second

such centre could with difficulty be found in Middlesex, or, rather, all there is centre. The revival of the short-lived see of Westminster might be suggested as a possible expedient; but the brief existence which this see enjoyed may be taken as showing that even in those days, when Westminster was really a town distinct from London, it was a failure. Now an arrangement which would place the Queen and Parliament in a diocese different from that which took in the 'city,' with all its important interests, stands self-condemned. The new Law Courts might be in one or in the other, but in either case the difficulty would remain identical. A nominal see of Westminster, in which the Abbey was to stand sponsor to the shepherd of a Surrey flock, would be more unreal and not more popular than the new statutable Rochester arrangement, and it would be no relief to London itself. Besides, anomalous as such an institution may be on primitive principles, an exempt jurisdiction, such as the Abbey, may leave it better fitted to fulfil its dignified and essential duty as the appointed scene of coronations and such high ceremonies, and the place at which (not being Canterbury) the Convocation of Canterbury can meet, without feeling itself in the presence of local difficulties, such as might beset it if held in the cathedral of a normal diocesan. A suggestion has been offered of a see for the East of London, and a munificent offer has been made to start it. This is at first sight a very attractive idea, but further reflection shows that all the argument is not on one side. Poor has strong claims upon rich London, because these are respectively the poor and the rich ends of the same place. But once let a separate see of poor London be constituted, and the two would no longer be ecclesiastically the same place; and the small sum once for all sunk in the endowment might be dearly bought by a chronic diminution of continuous sympathy and assistance. On the whole, a see of London, conterminous with the limits of Middlesex, may be cheerfully accepted as affording an appropriate field for a liberal experiment in the system of suffragans; or, more correctly speaking, of coadjutors. Supposing, however, that further experience showed that the more rural parts of Middlesex hung loosely on the capital, some future day might see them joined to the county of Hertford and see of St. Albans, and Essex be reconstituted under a bishop of its own, to which, by its population, in 1871, of 466,436, and area of 1,059,133 acres, it would be well entitled, particularly as London has overflowed into it. On so uncertain a question, however, we decline to dogmatise, while we pass on to con-

siderations directly connected with the arrangements consequent upon the St. Albans Bill.

The dream of raising St. Albans' happily undemolished abbey to the rank and work of a cathedral has been a favourite one ever since persons again began to interest themselves with ecclesiastical concerns. Practical grievances shook hands with sentiment over the ridiculous arrangement of the cathedral reformers who overhauled that quiet little venerable see of Rochester, which in old times numbered only ninety-three parishes, scattered over various parts of western Kent—a light task for a prelate who was expected to find leisure to act as the Archbishop of Canterbury's curate—and which, just leaving enough of Kent round the cathedral city to justify his retention of the old name, saddled the bishop with the care of Essex and Hertfordshire. As if there were not burden enough for one man, a subsequent shuffle transferred to him Kentish London—Deptford, Greenwich, and Woolwich—which had passed into the hands of the Bishop of London, at the same time that (excepting some two or three parishes) London in Surrey also reverted to Winchester. Bishop Wilberforce's abnormal personal aptitude for work suspended any reconsideration of this distribution during his tenure of Winchester. But it was impossible permanently to regulate the church on the supposition of a perpetuity of Wilberforces, and Bishop Harold Browne munificently offered to surrender the freehold property of Winchester House, St. James's Square, towards the endowment of another see for the relief of his own enormous diocese. We believe that his share in the arrangement ended with this munificent gift of a very desirable life-possession. The difficulties which so long delayed the sale of Winchester House, and the exaggerated estimate which was at first made of its market value, were circumstances which unhappily tended to tame the start of a scheme in which *elan* would have been so valuable. But as the house is now sold, we will not revert to this incident. As to the St. Albans part of the plan, supposing no further division possible north of the Thames, we have nothing to criticise. We think that, on the whole, the most judicious determination has been reached both as to area and to see town. The changes which are imminent in Kent and Surrey stand upon a different footing, and we should be glad if, even at this late moment, they could be reconsidered. Relieved of Essex and Herts, Rochester would be left with its old possession of the purely Kentish district about Rochester and Gravesend, and with that London in Kent which has recently reverted or been assigned to it. Surrey (with the

exceptions of Walworth, Kennington, and Barnes, which own the Bishop of London, and Croydon and Addington, which attach to Canterbury) composes, with Hampshire and the Channel Islands, the diocese of Winchester. What is now proposed is to take the parliamentary divisions of East and Mid Surrey (which include the portions now attaching to Canterbury and London, and which, with the exception of Addington, are to follow the fortunes of the remainder) and add them to Rochester; West Surrey continuing to form a part of Winchester. A house for the bishop of this new see of Rochester is then to be provided in Surrey, so as to perpetuate the divorce of that diocesan from his cathedral, to which the enforced residence of the prelate at Danbury had accustomed, without reconciling, those who might seem to have the first claims on his care.

The rationale of this proposal is obvious. It was intended by it roughly to convert Rochester into a Bishopric of South London. The two parliamentary divisions of Surrey which are to be transferred to it are those into which the metropolis has overflowed. Unhappily, however, the process, which is one requiring much delicate handling, has been too recklessly carried out. Surrey is no doubt a county within which a considerable portion of London stands. But for all that it is a county with the commendable *esprit de corps* of such a district. In that respect it differs from the smaller county of Middlesex, which is fairly oppressed by London. London in Middlesex presents itself as the great governing capital of Queen, Parliament, Law Courts, Corporation, City, West End. The normal county constitution, found in every other shire of the land, has been modified to meet this interpenetration, with its two Sheriffs of London and Middlesex, who are always City men of business, never country gentlemen. The smaller and poorer London of Surrey, on the other hand, is only a big suburb—a dreary expanse of slums. It is an incubus rather than a distinction to the county in which it stands. Surrey, very likely, would not object to seeing that inferior part of London which stands on its land collected up by itself as an independent ecclesiastical district, as it certainly would not dislike to see it dealt with as so much of Surrey simply. But this is just what, by a curious infelicity, the St. Albans Act misses doing. The three parliamentary divisions of Surrey are three strips running from north to south, or, rather, two such strips (namely East and Mid Surrey), and one rather square-shaped area (West Surrey); and while the northern ends of East and Mid Surrey are

London, the southern parts of each are simply and absolutely real rural Surrey. Thus the St. Albans Bill vivisects the county and makes one half of it an appanage to a cathedral in Kent, and the other half an appanage to one in Hampshire. This is what Surrey does not like. As little does Rochester like being made a convenience to give a title to a prelate who is ordered to live in Surrey. The remedy we propose is most simple. Let all Surrey (except Addington, where the Archbishop, and Farnham where the Bishop of Winchester lives) be constituted a sec. It can show (less these two parishes) 483,178 acres and 1,091,365 inhabitants. The cathedral stands ready built, where a bishop would be most useful, in St. Saviour's, Southwark. The Bishop of Winchester would still retain (in addition to the Channel Islands) the large county of Hants (including the Isle of Wight), with 1,032,105 acres and 544,684 people. The Bishop of Rochester also would receive a diocese amply sufficient for the energies of any man, however devoted, by adding to the cure which he already owns in Kent the remainder of the Parliamentary division of West (or London) Kent. The Archbishop of Canterbury would then be left with an almost rural diocese of East Kent, and all of Mid Kent, except the part round Rochester. No one who considers all the responsibility of the Primacy would grudge the Archbishop an alleviation of diocesan work. The feeling of dissatisfaction at being cut in two, which we referred to as existing in Surrey, would have no place in Kent, which has of old contained its two sees. It is one thing to be cut up and handed over to a couple of strangers, and another to see each half endowed with its own status of dignity and independence. Similarly we do not apprehend discontent in rural Middlesex, supposing it were to be, as we suggested, attached to St. Albans. It is now so completely overshadowed by London that such a change would increase its importance and power rather than reduce it to a subordinate condition.

This brings us to the end of the smaller scheme as embodied in the printed Report which we have been noticing. We promised, at the same time, to indicate that larger one, for which we own a theoretic preference; and we now find that we have, step by step, been referring to most of its details. But something more remains to be said. The Bishop of Ely rules over the three undivided counties of Cambridgeshire, Bedfordshire, and Huntingdonshire, with an aggregate area of 1,049,940 acres, and a population of 396,871; while the county of Norfolk imposes on the Bishop of Norwich the

supervision of 438,656 souls, spread over 1,356,173 acres. Each of these districts would, in the opinion of any rational man, be a very sufficient diocese. But, in addition, these two prelates have to divide between them the county of Suffolk, with 348,869 inhabitants and 949,825 acres. It is needless to say that the corporate feeling of churchmanship in Suffolk must, from no one's fault, but simply from physical causes, be at a minimum. When the time comes to form a Bishopric of Suffolk, the choice of see town will lie between Ipswich and Bury St. Edmunds. The former, the county town, has 43,163 inhabitants, but it lies rather inconveniently in the south-east corner of Suffolk, and has no conspicuous church. Bury St. Edmunds, with 14,928 souls, is more central, though somewhat to the west, and offers the choice of two unusually large churches, the appendages of its now destroyed abbey.

Henry VIII., in his very slapdash increase of the Episcopate, placed bishops at Gloucester and Bristol; carving out for the former a see in Gloucestershire, and to the latter assigning, in addition to the city of Bristol, the county of Dorset, although parted by the interposition of Somerset. In the late cathedral reforms, the sees of Gloucester and Bristol were united, but their separate cathedrals and capitular institutions were preserved, and Dorsetshire, with 627,265 acres and 195,537 population, was joined to Wiltshire, with 859,303 acres and 257,177 inhabitants, to form the re-constituted see of Salisbury. We hardly think that this population would justify a claim to re-assign Dorset to Bristol, even if we were to overlook the inconvenience of another diocese being interposed. Nevertheless, with two cathedrals existing, and still equipped, it would be hard, should private munificence make the offer, not to accept the largess which would again place Bristol under the pastoral care of its own bishop. After all, there would be no great hardship in trying for once the experiment of a really town bishop with only a moderate rural curtilage. Bristol, with its population, by the computation of 1875, of 196,186, might be a good field in which to try such an experiment. However, as we have said, with the figures before us, we neither advocate nor dissuade from an endowment, of which those who may offer it are the rightful judges.

To recapitulate. The scheme which we have been explaining proposes, in amplification of Mr. Cross's leading hints, the creation of six new sees, in addition to the twenty-nine which will exist as soon as St. Albans and Truro have been constituted. Five are in Northumberland, Yorkshire, Lancashire, Nottinghamshire, and Warwickshire respectively, and

the sixth would serve Surrey by a better arrangement of Rochester than that which the St. Albans Bill provides. In advocating this 'moderate' measure, we adhere to the opinion—while, for politic reasons, we refrain from pressing it—that the temporal *status in quo* of the Episcopate would well bear an addition up to forty sees, while the Church's spiritual work would be virtually the gainer by such a large-minded arrangement. Under such provision a second additional bishopric would be founded in Yorkshire and in Lancashire respectively, and Suffolk would have its own diocesan. Possibly, also, the addition of rural Middlesex to St. Albans would open the way to a see of Essex, thus relieving the Bishop of London. Whether the fifth bishopric would be sought at Wolverhampton in the Black Country, or follow a separation of Gloucester and Bristol, *θεῶν ἐν γούνασι κείται*. The former is the more pressing case; the latter would offer the more ready machinery.

We are conscious that we have been only offering a very slight sketch of a scheme for episcopal extension, but we shall not attempt to work it out in any detail, for among deceptive and fruitless tasks, that of rough-hewing detail stands conspicuous, and the limits of our article as contrasted with those of a book would forbid any nicety of workmanship. We have now to offer some observations on the policy of the movement, and, in particular, address ourselves to two classes of objectors within the circumference of hearty churchmanship, whose more or less unenthusiastic criticism may help to damp the energies of those who have heartily taken up the work. There are, on the one hand, those who do not wish for any more bishops, from some dissatisfaction with the conduct of the bishops who already exist; and there are, on the other hand, those who would help episcopal extension, but only on the condition that this extension was combined with unsparing reforms in the constitution of the English Episcopate.

We must commence by making a concession to the first-named of the above two classes. It must be confessed by the impartial student of the last half century of English Church history, who analyses its phenomena with the same passionless scrutiny of facts with which the man of science might compare the rainfall of successive seasons, that the English Episcopate has, on a general average of the whole period, overdone the part of drag-chain upon the Church movement. We lay stress upon the word 'average,' for in making this statement we desire to give our hearty testimony to the exceptional careers of bishops whose names we need hardly

particularise, and to many actions of other bishops whose general record, however meritorious, may not fully have entitled them to take their places on the list of distinctive eminence. We also dwell upon the fact that the period which we are considering has been one of movement, for we repudiate the suspicion of hinting at anything so unjust and untrue, as an imputation that the Episcopate has depressed the level, like the worldly, and worse than worldly, prelates whose careers are a blot upon the annals of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. The charge is, at the worst, one of not perceiving that it was a season of fast travelling and of settling their own pace accordingly. That which might have passed muster as actual progress in an age of stagnation may very possibly appear like reaction in days of general upheaval. We may without invidiousness refer to some specific instances in the Church history of the present reign in illustration of our meaning. When the persistent energy of one stout Welsh layman, the late Lord Powis, had succeeded in averting the union of the sees of Bangor and St. Asaph, the opponents whose resistance had been most persistent and difficult to overcome were Archbishop Howley and Bishop Blomfield; and yet Bishop Blomfield was a man who considered himself, and was in many respects, a foremost Church reformer, while to the Archbishop in concert with him is due the abatement of those inveterate and gigantic scandals, pluralities and non-residence. The scanty appreciation which these prelates manifested of the cathedral system in the great changes for which they were primarily responsible is another illustrative fact. But at a rather earlier date was it not to its bishops, as much as to any other class of its members, that the Church of England must attribute the great calamity, which darkened its rising hopes in the heyday of the movement which had up till then found its centre at Oxford? Did not bishops cruelly mismanage and irritate, by misapprehension, suspicion, and shallow depreciation, the spirit—acute and devout beyond compare, but sensitive in an equal degree, and not a little mystical—of John Henry Newman, till, under the provocations of prelate and tutor, he who might have been a king in Jeshurun took refuge in a Midian, from which there has been no return? In a few years later, when the Church of England had recovered from the wrench of Mr. Newman's defection, and of the inferior imitations by which it was followed; after its rising spirit of devotion had been fostered by one of Bishop Blomfield's charges, which, trifling as its recommendations would now seem, and feebly sustained as

some of them were by their own author, was, for the times in which they were offered, a sign and a standard—and, after the refusal of the same bishop to acquiesce in the wire-drawn refinements of the Gorham Judgment had warmed up men's faith in orthodox doctrine,—the same large-minded prelate, upon a breeze of popular distemperature, and under the attrition of uncongenial tempers, committed the incomprehensible blunder of converting friends into foes, without making foes into friends, by snatching at the resignation, offered under excited feelings, of a vicar, the support of whom would have won the ungrudging allegiance of the school which he had already conciliated, and by stigmatising forms of worship which are now, after so few years, generally accepted, by the epithet, intended to be opprobrious, of 'histrionic.'

In a few more weeks, when Lord John Russell had realised political capital out of this mistake in his scandalous Durham Letter, and England was aflame with a factitious outburst of puritan intolerance, the entire Episcopate, with a few exceptions, made the same mistake which we have seen them commit at a much more recent date, and in a feeble Pastoral exposed the section of Churchmen who were their own best friends to the fury of ignorant followers of a self-conceited Prime Minister. This was an occasion on which even Bishop Wilberforce, then young to the Episcopate, went with the multitude. Not so the brave Bishop Phillpotts, whose Pastoral of 1851 was, humanly speaking, the break-water against which the storm broke. But in the meanwhile the tempest had claimed its victims, and the Romeward defection of this crisis numbered, together with less conspicuous names, Robert Wilberforce, Manning, Hope Scott.

Passing on to recent events, we shall only ask when, four years since, the Athanasian Creed was in peril, who were the men who stood foremost in the will and the work of saving that bulwark of the faith from mutilation or suppression? Was it (with distinguished exceptions) prelates, or was it parish-priests, prominent laics and men of business? We shall not dwell upon the unhappy incidents which accompanied the Public Worship Regulation Act, and the unworthy Pastoral of the bishops issued early in 1875, for we have nothing to add to, or to retract from, what we said on these transactions in the first number of this *Review*.

Such are among the recollections which make some men, whose principles should lead them to be foremost in the work, to be apathetic about an increase in the number of our bishops. We have adverted to them with no pleasure, but

under the conviction that there is no such mischievous policy as that of letting a sore fester under the skin, when the stroke of the lancet is needed to let out the virus. While we regret and repudiate this want of spiritual courage, we desire to make all allowances for the persons whose public conduct we are driven to criticise. The Bench of Bishops must, of course, at any time present a body of men whose combined age is above the average of any similar number of adults taken by chance, and they must therefore be a body which, by the law of human nature, is prone to hug caution, and fails to grasp phenomena which have come into prominence within a period subsequent to what would have been the average age of the most intense mental receptivity. Besides, bishops are, of course, appointed for the merit of being 'safe' men; and their makers look to them to keep the peace. So, like other people whose mission is imposed upon them from the outside, they are under the temptation of discharging it somewhat mechanically. True—the objector will say—but the Bench has occupants who were once noticeable for onward energy; where are they now? The answer must be, that *esprit de corps* is a very powerful agent. One thing is, however, certain, that the more each bishop has for himself to do his own spiritual work—in his cathedral, in the rustic chancels of his villages, and in the slums of his big towns—the less will he be tempted to conjure up dangers and chaffer compromises. And one of the best securities for a conscientious bishop really living for his work, and continuing to maintain his early high-toned ideal of what his work should be, is, under God, the consciousness that the work is reasonably within his grasp. Let that work hang over him as one which is too vast and multifarious for the powers of any single man, however self-devoted, and what wonder if the overtaken self-devotion thins out like an overstrained limb or muscle, and the dead-weight of inevitable failure crushes at once his fervour of spirit and his energy of mind? Depend upon it that two bishops with manageable dioceses are worth much more than twice as much as one bishop with an unmanageable see.

If (as we believe) episcopacy is of divine origin, God's blessing will rest upon it in proportion as it lives up to the intention of the Power of which it is the emanation; and in this proportion, therefore, the most effectual, because the most faithful plan which can be thought out for curing its defects, and raising its tone, will be to make the fulfilment of those intentions possible by co-ordinating bishops and sees within moderate and workable proportions. The bishop who most

freely and most often meets the clergy and laity of his fold in synod and in conference; the bishop who lives most intimately with his chapter in counsel and love; the bishop who is most at home in his churches, confirming and preaching, will be the bishop to whom Churchmen can most confidently look in the hour of need for the words and deeds of a Christian pastor. To make such a bishop physically possible is, in brief, the object of the increase of the Episcopate.

These considerations bring us face to face with the second class of critics to whom we have referred. These are the persons who are willing to work for an increase of the Episcopate, but who will only do so on condition that the redistribution of sees is accompanied by changes of a decided character in the status of the bishops themselves and in their relations to Church and State. Those who hold such opinions may plausibly contend that a mere diminution in the size of the dioceses would be illusory for good unless accompanied by other changes, the inevitable drift of which would be—to put it plainly and roughly—the notable abatement of the secular dignity which has from time immemorial environed the office of bishop in this land. In considering the arguments of these controversialists we must request those of them who acquiesce in such a policy, at least so long as they condescend to listen to us, to come down from the regions of *à priori* and to entertain the matter in the light of a question of combined civil and religious interest, under conditions which have imperceptibly shaped themselves during centuries of prosperous national life. Those, on the other hand, among them who are not conscious of ulterior wishes, must allow us to assume that—at all events in our view of the question—such results have to be anticipated as within the range of those possibilities which must be faced. The question whether the English Episcopate is the best conceivable form of that institution is one of so eminently unpractical a character as to rule itself out of the controversy. The answer, of course, will be ‘no,’ and after this answer is given querist and respondent will be just where they were before. But the man who inquires whether, admitting the mixture of better and of inferior elements in that institution, and facing the actual most complicated condition of English society, it is probable that any notable dislocation of the episcopal system as it exists would be succeeded by a purer and more spiritual organisation, deserves a careful reply. We shall consider ourselves engaged with this inquirer, and shall analyse successive incidents in the light of the problem which he has submitted.

We must, at the same time, fairly confess that our bias is rather to accept known anomalies than to risk uncertain dangers, with the consciousness that we should have made ourselves active participators in any accruing evil, while, at all events, we are sufferers, and not agents, in anything which may now be working badly.

We shall commence with noticing one or two points of reform which are intended by their projectors to strengthen (though with a difference) rather than supplant the *status in quo*. First, comes the suggestion that the Parliamentary bishops might be chosen out of the whole body by the votes of their brethren, and not succeed by a rotation of seniority. The authors of this scheme, we believe, have not sufficiently analysed the theory on which bishops sit in the Upper House. Otherwise they would have appreciated that such an innovation might deal a heavy blow to the constitutional position and privileges of the first of the three estates of the realm—'The Lords Spiritual.' Under the existing system each bishop sits *jure proprio*, as his predecessors have ever done since there has been a Great Council of the Nation. No doubt the innovation of the rotation suspends the seat and vote of the juniors. Still, when they enter within the sacred number, their own inherent right bursts into life, and each in turn finds himself possessed of privileges which he owes in no degree to the indulgence of his brethren. An elected body, on the other hand, would represent the electors who made it, and as each member would be shorn of half his self-sufficiency and prestige, so the whole would exist upon a lower basis of authority. The Lords Spiritual would become merely the representatives of the 'Lord Bishops,' and thus, by the change, a very rude blow would have been dealt to the interpenetration of Church and State in the realm of England, which is feebly, if not inaccurately, summed up in the word Establishment. An establishment is one thing, and, as we could easily prove, the Irish Church is even now entitled to be considered as re-established in a fresh shape by the very Act which disestablished it in its former shape. There is a grim irony in its current name of the 'disestablished' Church as implying in fact the 'somewhat established' Church. Who, on the other hand, ever thought of calling the Episcopal Church of Scotland a 'disestablished' Church, although it was really and completely disestablished—so much so as to make the use of any epithet pointing back to its formerly more prosperous worldly condition an impertinence? So, in France, there are three established Churches—Romanism, 'the Reformed

Cult,' and Judaism—while Anglicanism, the Greek Church, Wesleyanism, are dissenting bodies. But the identification of the bishop-ruled Church of England with kingship in England, which is some two centuries older than the revival by Charles the Great of the Roman Empire, and more than two centuries older than the recognised kingdom of all England, is a very much more substantial matter than any mere 'establishment,' and one, to preserve which we are willing to bear much which seems intolerable, and to forbear much which seems irresistible. A mere 'establishment' is a matter of calculation which has its money value, and may be compensated. The unique *Ecclesia Anglicana* of history can never be priced and never be replaced, and to fear for it, no less than fight for it, rises to the dignity of principle. Once there was a Gallican Church, which seemed capable of a similar history, but it fell, and we see the result. But on lower, though very practical grounds, the project is liable to serious objections. A self-elected body is apt to be absolutely unrepresentative of the minority of the electors. In proof of this tendency we have no need to go further than the representative peerages of Scotland and Ireland. The former elects its whole list each general election, while in the latter body the choice is single and for life. But the result is the same with a whole list or with a single representative. We must also remember that the Minister who, in making a bishop, is now merely acting as the patron of a single vote, and one, too, which, by the rotation system, may probably be deferred till he is himself out of office, would not be slow to see and to grasp at the far greater power which would come into his hands as donor of an immediately operative voice in an electoral college. If he did not at once perceive it, others would be sure to see it for him; and at each successive vacancy of a see, the partisan ecclesiastical papers would be full of unedifying calculations as to the balance of opinions within the existing Episcopate, and of the chances of the next Parliamentary election, according as the new-comer might be ticked off as High, Low, or Broad.

We may as well here dispose of a singularly fallacious objection which has been brought against an increase in the number of sees, in combination with the system of rotation. Persons of great acuteness are found to argue that an increase in the whole number, combined with the maintenance of the Parliamentary limitation, must lead to the Lords Spiritual of Parliament becoming an old and broken-down body. Such an impression is hardly creditable

to the intellectual activity of the thinking classes. Very little reflection ought to show that such an increase, so limited, would tend not to raise the age of attaining Parliament so much as to lower that of first entering the Episcopate. This may be very simply illustrated by an example. We will substitute for the House of Lords the Senate of Dreamland, and assume that, at some period, the Episcopate of that realm consisted of three persons, all members of the Senate, —Cyril, dating from 1840, Gregory from 1858, and Basil from 1865. The two men whom public opinion pointed out as sure to be promoted to the next vacant mitres were Clement and Cyprian; and, in the meanwhile, two new sees were created in 1870 and 1872, the seats in the Senate being still restrained to three, and the principle of rotation introduced. Clement was the first bishop under the new system, and he did not find his way into the Senate until 1873, on Cyril's death; and, in the meanwhile, Cyprian had been raised to the second new see in 1872. Clement lived to enjoy his honours for a very brief period, and was succeeded in the Senate by Cyprian in 1874, while Ambrose was called to the see which his death vacated, Hilary having been previously consecrated to that of Cyril. Thus the result of the increase of the Episcopate was that of Clement, already a bishop, becoming also a senator in 1873 on Cyril's death, while Cyprian, already a bishop, became also a senator on Clement's death in 1874, while Hilary and Ambrose had entered the Episcopate, though still without senatorial rank. Supposing, however, that there had been no increase in the number of sees, but that Clement and Cyprian had in due course succeeded to their mitres, then Clement would have become both bishop and senator in 1873, and Cyprian both bishop and senator in 1874. Hilary too, and Ambrose, would have to have waited for their turns of the spiritual rank, carrying with it the senatorship, as they have now only to do for the temporal rank. But both will come to them at the date on which they will now step into the latter. The consequence of the increase in the number of sees had, accordingly, by this hypothesis, resulted in an earlier and a larger contribution of episcopal work to the ecclesiastical commonwealth, but it had left the episcopo-senatorial age where it found it. Of course actual events could not be expected to follow the rigid lines of the hypothetical case. For instance, the Ministry might change, and then the 'Clement' of one year would possibly be a different man (and a younger as likely as an older one) from the anticipated 'Clement' of three years previously, although the average age of Clements

in general would probably be maintained. Accordingly, the example which we have drawn out is sufficient to show that the criticism overlooks necessarily the considerations growing out of the change itself. With more bishops we make little doubt that a lower average minimum of age for accession to the Episcopate is more likely to follow than increased senescence in the House of Lords, and that, after all, is in popular language the result which we have drawn out in a somewhat technical form.

The suggestions which we have been considering are those of moderate thinkers. But we find beyond them the ideas of those who believe that the Establishment would be strengthened by the entire removal of bishops from the House of Lords, and possibly by the substitution for the actual nomination of some popular system of election, and behind these, again, stand the men who are weary altogether of the idea of an Established Church, and to whom episcopal extension and reform is a strategic move in the campaign of disestablishment. We have already had occasion incidentally to speak upon the question of nomination, and we need not repeat the common-places by which the banishment of bishops from any share in secular legislation may be defended. They are of that class of truisms in which assertions which are abstractedly undeniable are put forward without regard to the actual attitude of, or the historical reasons for, the institutions on which those who utter them pass infallible judgments. They are essentially 'principles of 1789,' if not of '1793.' When it has been proved to us that the quality of a 'Lord Spiritual' involves worldliness, and that the abolition of such a 'munus' is the philosopher's stone which will transmute 'proud prelates' into heavenly-minded apostles, we shall be found giving voice and vote for the innovation. In the meanwhile, as we have already indicated, we see too clearly, and value too genuinely, the exceptional recognition of the Christian Faith which the English Constitution involves, and which the English Constitution has continued to involve even when mated with Scotland as Presbyterianised for political objects by William the Deliverer,¹ and Ireland as manipulated by another William—rashly to abandon our distinctive inheritance. We must, in passing, offer one explanation. The privilege which the bishops possess is the power of sitting and voting in the House of Lords, and not the compulsion to do so, such as attaches

¹ It is a matter of historical fact that if the Scotch bishops would have consented to take the oaths to William and Mary, Episcopacy would never have been disestablished in that country.

with more or less stringency to the life, or elected, senates of other countries. Between these two ideas a great, though often neglected, difference lies, and yet it is obvious that this consideration disposes of any analogy which any one might strive to set up between seats of bishops in the House of Lords and assessorships in any court of appeal which carry with them inflexible duties of attendance.

In our counsels of caution, directed to the possible tendencies of changes dictated by ideas of theoretic propriety, or of uniformity, which carries with itself no tangible benefit, we have necessarily traversed the policy of the more advanced Church reformers. To orthodox Churchmen, students of the primitive centuries, who look forward to an era of disestablishment, as the advent of the golden age, we only address one word, and that is—Ireland. Upon our generation has devolved the work of repairing the breaches of many generations. This labour involves numberless particulars, and persons of all tastes and studies may find their occupation in helping on this great result. The antagonisms of parties and the polemics of sections are, we may be sure, being overruled, through the ages all along, towards that unity which has its root in complexity. As a contribution, local and present, but for this country and this age most important, and one upon which differing opinions may with perfectly safe consciences combine, we recommend the movement which is already a public question, within the administrative no less than the moral sphere, for the increase of the English Episcopate.

SHORT NOTICES.

THEOLOGY.

An Analysis of Religious Belief. BY VISCOUNT AMBERLEY.
(London: Trübner and Co., 1876.)

It is commonly held by Christians, that the Creator of the universe 'made of one blood' (or, as some read it, simply 'of one') 'all nations of men.' Further, Christians see reason to believe, that a great amount of religious knowledge, though it became in time

sadly obscured and corrupted, was handed down by tradition in the Gentile world: a view, it may be observed, strongly corroborated by the language of Plato, of Cicero, and even of Seneca, which often seems to point to the existence of some primeval revelation. Consequently Christian students are in nowise astonished, when they find in heathen poems, or in books held sacred by this or that people, some adumbrations of what Christ's religion teaches concerning God, and a golden age, and the fall, and heaven and hell, and the hopes of restoration through some heroic champion of our race. Inquiry into these matters has of late years taken the form of a comparative study of the religions of the world—a science never so much as imagined, except in countries where a knowledge of Christianity has penetrated. It is a field of investigation from which believers have never shrunk. Among those who in this century have done the most, from a Christian point of view, to enlarge our knowledge of this deeply interesting subject, may be named Windischmann, Neander, Möhler, Maurice, Hardwick, Döllinger, Sir William Muir, Bishop Callaway, Dr. Legge, Canon Morris, Rowland Williams, Professors Wilson and Monier Williams, and the authors of various articles in well-known Encyclopædias. For earlier illustrations of kindred inquiries we must go back to S. Clement and the school of Alexandria.

An attempt at a contribution to this department of thought and knowledge has been made, as our readers are doubtless well aware, by the late Viscount Amberley, in two rather thick octavo volumes. The author was not without some of the gifts which fit a man for an inquiry of this nature. He seems to have read widely for his years, to have possessed considerable metaphysical acuteness, and to have at least desired to find truth. But we cannot think that he sought for truth in a proper spirit, or pursued a correct intellectual method. His gifts were marred by a self-confident dogmatism, by a spirit of such ostentatious contempt for the feelings of others, as must almost necessarily preclude him from understanding their position, and which must consequently prevent him from arriving at anything like scientific exactness. Moreover, it is obvious, that to take only the *residuum*—only that which is left, after all distinctive characteristics of each religion have been pared away, must necessarily involve (as is justly pointed out in the excellent critique given in the *Athenæum* [No. 2,540], which we would recommend to the especial notice of our readers) an acceptance of the lowest and not the highest forms of the religious sentiment as embodying the true standard of belief. Now let us just imagine this method of inquiry applied to any other subject. Who would care for a standard of art, of poetry, of literature in general, of mental or of physical science, which had been attained to by such a process?

Next there arise the following questions:—1. Is the examination fairly comprehensive, embracing the religions, if not of all the nations, yet at any rate of the most prominent and energetic ones? 2. Does it contemplate the results, as well as the external similarities, of creeds? 3. Lastly, does the writer exhibit capability of appre-

ciating the highest manifestations of that religious spirit, which he criticises with such freedom and in so supremely self-satisfied a manner? All three questions must, we think, be answered in the negative.

1. One vast *lacuna* seems to be patent at the first glance. It is generally believed by educated people, that Europe, for a period of at least six hundred years before the Christian epoch, witnessed the career of two most prominent nations, known respectively as the Greeks and the Romans; that these nations achieved a great work in the education of mankind, Greece affording models of patriotic zeal, of skill in architecture, in sculpture, in mathematics, in literature of every class and in mental science; Rome, though less brilliant in displays of individual genius, exhibiting far greater powers in the way of government and of jurisprudence. Further, it is believed that the moral condition of these highly-gifted nations was, at the time of Christ's coming, simply deplorable. If S. Paul be not accepted as a witness on this score, we have only to appeal to Livy, Ovid, Suetonius and others; if the researches of Christian students, as a Merivale or a Döllinger, are to be put on one side, we can turn to those of a Gibbon or a Renan. But the further fact remains, that these nations, having on their side both intellectual power, and physical force, saw in less than three centuries the religion of the Cross waxing stronger and stronger; saw what they called a detestable superstition win to itself, despite fierce persecutions, not only the poor and humble, but the practical sense of great lawyers, the eloquence of distinguished rhetoricians, the countenance of warriors and of statesmen, until at length the despised Cross was mounted on the imperial diadem. This wonderful phenomenon needs surely some examination, some explanation at the hands of one who professes to supply us with an 'Analysis of Religious Belief.' Even Gibbon at least confessed thus much, and attempted, with what success we do not now stop to inquire, to draw out an elaborate statement of secondary causes for the triumph of Christianity: a religion, in his words, 'still professed by the nations of Europe, the most distinguished portion of humankind in arts and learning as well as in arms,' and also, as he proceeds to observe, widely diffused throughout Asia and Africa, and in a Western hemisphere unknown to the ancients. But because the Greeks and Romans had no sacred books, and because the possession of such books is a part of Lord Amberley's theory, these nations, who ought to occupy two of the foremost places in such a review, are simply and absolutely excluded. Clearly, then, the book is not comprehensive.

2. But it fails equally, to our thinking, in another kind of comprehensiveness. Here, for example, is a specimen of our author's judgments: 'We cannot but conclude that every form of worship is equally good and equally indifferent; and that the faith of the Christian, who drinks the blood of Christ on the banks of the Thames, stands on the same intellectual level with that of the Brahman, who quaffs the juice of the Soma on the banks of the Ganges'—(vol. ii. p. 382.) Equally good! Well; we have seen it maintained

that the pantheism of India has, in the sphere of the intellect, destroyed the historic sense; and as for the 'equally good' in moral results, we are content to cite the testimony of a single witness. 'It is not necessary that a man should be a Christian to wish for the propagation of Christianity in India. It is sufficient that he should be an European not much below the ordinary European level of good sense and humanity. In no part of the world is heathenism more cruel, more licentious, more fruitful of absurd rites and pernicious laws. *The conversion of the whole country to the worst form that Christianity ever wore in the darkest ages would be a most happy event.*' Now these are not the words of an ardent missionary, who might be thought prejudiced in favour of Christianity; nor again of a youthful sciolist like Lord Amberley, but of a politician and historian who had passed some of the best years of his life in India,—Lord Macaulay. But what is the good of a professed analysis, which does not analyse results of religious creeds and the causes of these results? Christian morality, Christian art, Christian literature, Christian civilisation, are utterly ignored in these volumes. Obviously, then, such a survey must utterly fail in depth and in true comprehensiveness.

It is so throughout. Lord Amberley, for instance, is fully aware of some of the weak points in the character of Mohammed, and is more severe upon them than is the Christian Möhler. This may so far do good as to mark some reaction from the far too favourable estimate of Mr. Bosworth Smith. But a comparison of Lord Amberley's examination of Mohammedanism with the monographs of Möhler and of Döllinger on the same theme (of which some general idea may be obtained from the *Encyclopædia Britannica*) reveals the poverty and thinness of these volumes. In the same way Döllinger's account of Parseeism in his *Heidenthum und Judenthum* (or, as his English translator calls it, *The Jew and Gentile*, &c.), is far superior to Lord Amberley's. In many places where these volumes are at their best, they owe almost everything to Christian Missionaries, as Canon (now Bishop) Callaway and the Rev. Dr. Legge. Judaism suffers on one side. That erotic element, especially conspicuous in the Psalms, and so beautifully described by Arthur Hallam in a passage quoted by us in our first No. (*Church Quarterly Review* vol. 1. p. 173), is ignored: and so the superiority of Judaism to Heathenism is not brought out. But Judaism, on another side, in its contest with Christianity, is represented as consistent and to a great extent successful; and Lord Amberley becomes an apologist for the Crucifixion of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

3. We are all familiar with the inability of this or that writer to understand and enter into a particular character. Thus, *e.g.*, Mr. Carlyle will not allow to Voltaire the capacity for appreciating the career of Martin Luther, and a large number of historical students will in this matter entirely accept the conclusion arrived at by Carlyle. To others we leave it to judge how far Lord Amberley was capable of appreciating the words and acts and character of the Redeemer. That a Christian mother should suppose that her son, now in that unseen

world, would in his present state of being rejoice that his crude and most irreverent speculations concerning the Head of our race should be given to the world is strange and sad. We have no desire to judge him. It was his lot to fall upon one of those seasons of reaction against belief, which set in when John Henry Newman gave up the battle of Anglicanism against Scepticism; and when young men, unsettled and unhinged, turned for guidance to John Stuart Mill. In some vague way the author of these volumes did acknowledge the existence of the three great elements of religion, God and the human soul, and intercourse between the two. But his idea of God was apparently Pantheistic:—a Being from whom the soul can gain neither graces nor consolations. He, whom Christians recognise as Mediator between God and man, is the subject of coarse insults, not unlike those of Celsus and Voltaire. Some of the borrowed descriptions given in these volumes are true and good: some of the *oliter dicta* well deserve consideration. But, taken as a whole, there is no chance whatever either of their living long or of their gaining any extensive influence.

(Second Notice.)

Τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις Πατρὸς ἡμῶν Κλήμεντος ἐπισκόπου Ῥώμης αἱ ἐνὺ πρὸς Κορινθίους ἐπιστολαί, ἐκ χειρογράφου τῆς ἐν Φαναρίῳ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως Βιβλιοθήκης τοῦ Παναγίου Τάφου νῦν πρῶτον ἐκδιέδμεναι πηλεῖς ὑπὸ Φιλίθεου Βρύννιου Μητροπολίτου Σερρών. (Constantinople: Boutra. London: Nutt.)

THE newly discovered chapters of S. Clement's first Epistle are of so much importance and interest, that we propose a second time to call our readers' attention to them. Are they, we may well ask, in harmony with those that precede and follow? Do they strengthen any characteristics already observed in the other parts of the Epistle, and so tend to give unity to the Epistle as a whole? These questions are important, but capable of a very satisfactory answer we think.

Horace enriched—as Cato and Ennius, he says himself (*Ars Poet.* l. 55), had done before him—the Latin language with many words and expressions. Every great writer must necessarily do the same. A writer, if at all voluminous, must be commonplace indeed who makes no mark, for good or for evil, upon the thought and language of succeeding writers. S. Jerome (quoted in Alford, *Heb.* xi. i.), speaks of the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews as 'Philoneum aliquid spirans' in a certain passage. Philo's influence on the New Testament (greater, perhaps, than is commonly supposed) cannot well be denied. It was not, however, confined to the New Testament. We find ample traces of it in our Clement,¹ in his namesake of

¹ e.g. δημιουργὸς τῶν πάντων, ἀέναι πηγὰί, χορὸς ἀστέρων, μεγάλαί δὲ καὶ ὑπερβαλλούσαι δωρεαὶ (μεγαλοπρεπέσι καὶ ὑπερβαλλούσαις δωρεαῖς—*Clem.* i. 19), τὰ ὄμματα τῆς ψυχῆς, ἀνέδωκεν ἡ φύσις οἱ μαστοὺς ποταμῶν ρεῖθρα καὶ πηγῶν—*De Mund. Offic.* § 45, p. 32: *Mangey*. (Cf. ἀέναι πηγὰί—*παρι-*

Alexandria, and in many of the Fathers of the first four centuries. It extended in a remarkable, but perfectly natural, manner to the Liturgies of the Church.¹

If such was the influence of the writings of Philo the Jew, still greater, we should say, must have been that of the Epistle of S. Clement, the Christian Bishop—a document so widely known, so highly approved, and in so many places publicly read, that Canon Lightfoot² calls it 'liturgical,' meaning thereby quasi-canonical: read, that is, at the times when, and in the places where, the Canonical Scriptures were anciently read, though not itself accepted as such.

Numerous references to and traces of that portion of the Epistle which has long been in our possession have been observed by commentators. We need not trouble our readers with these. Something still remains to be done as to this portion of the Epistle. We are not aware, for example, that Didymus³ has ever been brought forward as a witness; yet he certainly seems to refer to a noteworthy passage in S. Clement's 20th chapter, and this is not the only trace of our Epistle in the writings attributed to Didymus. Nor are we aware that the versions of the Old Testament Scriptures by Aquila, Theodotion, Symmachus, and others unnamed in Origen's *Hexapla*, have ever been claimed as bearing testimony to the influence of S. Clement. We see no reason why they should not. In a few cases⁴ S. Clement's quotations approximate to those versions. We

χονται τοὺς πρὸς ζωῆς ἀνθρώποις μαζούς—*Clem.* i. 20.) Θεὸς ἀνεπίδεξ ὁὐδενὸς χρήζων—*De Fort.* § 3, vol. 2, p. 377. (Cf. ἀπροσδεὴς (*Philo*) οὐδενὸς χρήζει—*Clem.* i. 52.) And the use of such words as παμπληθής, παμμεγεθής, ἐλλόγγμος (see Note 1, p. 243), προσφεύγειν ('altogether a late and somewhat rare word'—*Lightfoot*). (We may notice a gradual definiteness of use of this word. τοῖς οἰκτιρμοῖς αὐτοῦ—*Clem.* τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ—*Ignat.* τῷ θεῷ—*Clem. Hom.* τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ—*Did.* τῇ ἱερᾷ τραπέζῃ—*Greg. Naz.*) ἐπάλληλος; βίαναν-σος, προστάτης, εὐκταῖος, δημιουργεῖν, δημιουργία, &c. We may conjecture that some words, of which little account can be given, were derived from some works of Philo not now extant.

¹ Note especially ὑπόμνησιν ποιεῖν, τὰς ὑπὲρ τοῦ κόσμου εὐχὰς καὶ θυσίας ἐπιτελεῖν, and the ἐπιφοίτησις τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος found in all Liturgies and in various writers, e.g. Didymus, and which seems to come from Philo. Cf. προφητικὸν πνεύματος ἐπιφοιτήσαντος—*Vit. Mos.* i. 50, vol. 2, p. 124. ἐπιπροφητικὸς δὲ καὶ ἐνφωκίτος τοῦ θείου πνεύματος—*De Spec. Leg.* § 8, vol. 2, p. 343, and elsewhere.

² *Epistles of S. Clement of Rome*, p. 11.

³ εἰ γὰρ καὶ ὡκεανὸς ἀπέραντος, ἀλλ' οὐν καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτὸν κόσμοι ταῖς τοῦ Δεσπότου διαταγαῖς διδύνονται. πάντα γὰρ τὰ πρὸς αὐτοῦ γεγενημένα ὑπο ποτ' ἔστιν ταγαῖς τῆς ἑαυτοῦ προνοίας διοικουμένα ἰθύνεται—*Did. Expos. Ps.* 138: *Migne*, p. 1596. ὡκεανὸς ἀνθρώποις ἀπέραντος, καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτὸν κόσμοι ταῖς αὐταῖς ταγαῖς τοῦ Δεσπότου διενθύνονται—*Clem.* i. 20. ὡκεανὸς ἀπέραντος ἀνθρώποις καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτὸν κόσμοι τοσαύταις διαταγαῖς τοῦ Δεσπότου διοικούνται—*Orig. Select. Ezech.* vol. 3, p. 422. We may notice a twofold play upon the words of S. Clement and Origen.

⁴ (1.) *Clem.* § 28: καταστρώσω (*Ps.* cxxxix. 7-10). LXX. καταβῶ. 'The fifth version (ε in Origen) has στρώσω'—*Lightfoot*.

(2.) § 21: πνεῦμα Κυρίου λῦχνος ἐρευνῶν τὰ ταμεία τῆς γαστρὸς—*Prov.*

are aware that in two cases other explanations have been given. The suggestion, however, which we throw out seems the simplest and most satisfactory explanation, and applicable to all alike. We lay no stress on this beyond claiming these versions as among the writings which more or less bear witness to a knowledge of S. Clement's Epistle. Further research may show the witness of these versions to be greater than at present appears.

There is another and very definitely marked feature in our Epistle which has hardly, we think, been sufficiently remarked upon, and which the newly-discovered portion raises into one of great prominence and importance; we mean its liturgical character—liturgical in the stricter sense. Bignonius, A.D. 1633, in his letter to Grotius upon this Epistle, said that it seemed to him 'liturgias et euchologia Græcorum sapere.' He gave no illustration of this, but his opinion was perfectly sound. As it is of some importance to the integrity of the Epistle to bring this feature plainly out, we have put a good many illustrations into a Note,¹ from which our readers will be able to judge of the correctness of Bignonius' remark.

xx. 27. LXX.: φῶς Κυρίου πνοῇ ἀνθρώπων, ὡς ἐρευνᾷ ταμεῖα κοιλίας. A.Σ.Θ. λύχνος. ΑΛΛ. πνεῦμα—Orig. Hex. Bahrdt.

(3.) § 8.: πυρρότεροι κόκκον. Cf. Is. i. 18. LXX.: ὡς φοινικοῦν, ὡς χιόνα λευκανῶ· εἰν δὲ ὄσιν ὡς κόκκινον, ὡς ἔριον λευκανῶ. Σ. εἰν δὲ πυρραὶ ὄσιν ὡς κόκκινον—Orig. Hex. Bahrdt.

¹ τοῖς ἐφοδίοις τοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοὺς λόγους αὐτοῦ ἐπιμελῶς ἐνεστερνισμένοι, ἀμνησικακοὶ εἰς ἀλλήλους, ἐν τῷ φόβῳ αὐτοῦ ἐπιτελείτε in § 2; ἰκέται γενόμενοι τοῦ ἐλέους καὶ τῆς χρηστότητος αὐτοῦ: προσπέσωμεν—ἐπὶ τοὺς οἰκτιρμούς αὐτοῦ, τῇ μεγαλοπρεπείᾳ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ in § 9: ἀστέρων χοροὶ, ἐπ' αὐτῆς ζωῇ ἀνατέλλει τροφήν, τὴν λειτουργίαν ἐπιτελοῦσιν, ἐν ὁμοιοῖα καὶ εἰρήνῃ ποιοῦνται, δεσπότης τῶν ἀπάντων of § 20; βοησωμεν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐκτενῶς εἰς τὸ μετόχους ἡμᾶς γενέσθαι of § 34; which are all more or less closely represented in the Liturgies and *Apost. Constitutions*. We give a more detailed account of § 44, and of § 64, which follows immediately after the newly discovered portion of the Epistle.

Notice two places where the author of *Apostolic Constitutions* has taken up S. Clement's thought scripturally.

εἰς ἐπισκοπὴν κατασθῆναι—A. C. ii. 1, p. 13. Ueltzen.

δοκιμαθεὶς καθιστάσθω ἐν εἰρήνῃ—A. C. ii. 1, p. 13.

ὑπὸ παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ ἐκλελεγμένον—συνελθὼν ὁ λαὸς—συνευδοκεῖται—A. C. viii. 4, p. 195.

ἐμπειρος τοῦ λόγου—A. C. ii. 1, p. 13.

δὸς—ποιμαίνειν τὴν ἀγίαν σου ποιήν—ἀμέμπτως λειτουργοῦντα—A. C. viii. 5, p. 196.

πᾶς ὑψὼν ἐαντὸν ταπεινωθήσεται—A. C. ii. 2, p. 13.

ἀδάνανσος among pre-requisites for ministry—A. C. ii. 3, p. 14.

§ 44. καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἡμῶν ἔγνωσαν διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὅτι ἐπὶ ἔσται περὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς. διὰ ταύτην οὖν τὴν αἰτίαν πρόγνωσιν εὐληφότες τελείαν, κατέστησαν τοὺς προειρημένους, καὶ μεταξὺ ἐπιδοχὴν ἔδωκαν, ὅπως, εἰν τινες κοιμηθῶσι, διαδέξωνται ἕτεροι δοκιμασμένοι ἄνδρες τὴν λειτουργίαν αὐτῶν. τοὺς οὖν κατασταθέντας ὑπ' ἐκείνων ἢ μεταξὺ ὑφ' ἑτέρων ἐλλογίμων ἀνδρῶν, συνευδοκησάσθης τῆς ἐκκλησίας πάσης, καὶ λειτουργήσαντας ἀμέμπτως τῷ

VOL. III.—NO. V.

R

Besides this general 'sapor' of the Liturgical writings, as Bignonius calls it, we must observe that our Epistle contains a considerable number of words and expressions¹ which, though not all, or indeed many of them so used by S. Clement, acquired, as time went on, a special liturgical or canonical importance and force.

On turning to the newly discovered chapters of the Epistle, it is natural and right to ask whether they bear upon them any or all of these special features to which we have called attention as marking the other portions of the document. These new chapters ought to bear some impress of Philo, to receive some witness from succeeding writings, to be capable of being shown to have given many things to the ancient Liturgies of the Church, and, lastly, they should contain some words and expressions which in after times acquired special liturgical or canonical force. We give the results, or most of them

ποιμνίᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ ταπεινοφροσύνης, ἡσύχως καὶ ἀβαναύσως, μεμαρτυρημένους τε πολλοῖς χρόνοις ὑπὸ πάντων, τούτους οὐ δικαίως νομίζομεν ἀποβάλλεσθαι τῆς λειτουργίας. ἡμαρτία γὰρ οὐ μικρὰ ἡμῖν ἔσται, ἐὰν τοὺς ἀμέμπτως καὶ ὁσίως προσενηκόντας τὰ δῶρα τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἀποβάλωμεν. μακάριοι οἱ προοδοιπορήσαντες πρεσβύτεροι, οἵτινες ἔγκαρπον καὶ τελείαν ἔσχον τὴν ἀνάλυσιν· οὐ γὰρ εἰλαβοῦνται, μὴ τις αὐτοὺς μεταστήσῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἰδρυμένου αὐτοῖς τόπου. ὁρῶμεν γὰρ ὅτι ἐνίοις ὑμεῖς μετηγάγετε καλῶς πολιτευομένους ἐκ τῆς ἀμέμπτως αὐτοῖς τετιμημένης λειτουργίας.

§ 64. ὁ παντεπόπτης Θεός. Cf. § 55 : παντεπόπτης δεσπότης.

ἡμᾶς δι' αὐτοῦ εἰς λαὸν περιούσιον.

δόξῃ πάσῃ ψυχῇ ἐπικεκλημένη τὸ μεγαλοπρεπὲς καὶ ἅγιον ὄνομα αὐτοῦ πίστιν, φόβον, κ. τ. λ.

εἰς εὐαρέστησιν.

δόξα, μεγαλοσύνη, κράτος καὶ τιμὴ καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰῶνων.

¹ μεγαλοπρεπέσι καὶ ὑπερβαλλούσαις δωρεαῖς in some form (πνευματικαῖς, ἀθανάτοις, ἐπουρανίοις, &c.) in all Liturgies; ἁγίαις καὶ ἀμώμοις χερσὶ (applied by Clement to the Creator) in this or some other form (ἱεραῖς, ἀμιάνοις, ἀχράντοις, &c.) to our Lord, in the Last Supper, in all Liturgies; προκείμενος—as the προκείμενα δῶρα—ἀναπέμπειν, ἀποβάλλειν, ὑπομνήσκειν, συνενδοκεῖν, ἐπικαλεῖν (the ἐπικλήσις), ἐπιτελεῖν, παρίσταναι, πρὸθεσις, ἐφύδιον, &c.

μεμαρτυρημένους ὑπὸ τῶν συνόντων—A. C. ii. 1, p. 13.

εἰ μαρτυρεῖται ὑπὸ πάντων—A. C. ii. 1, viii. 4, pp. 13, 195.

ἀποβάλλεσθω—A. C. viii. 23, and common technical word.

προσφέρειν σοι τὰ δῶρα τῆς ἁγίας σου ἐκκλησίας—A. C. viii. 5, p. 196.

μακάριοι οἱ πραεῖς, μακάριοι, κ.τ.λ.—A. C. ii. 2, p. 13.

εἰλαβοῦμενοι—καθίσταται ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς—A. C. ii. 2, pp. 14, 13.

ἐπίσκοπος ὡς Θεοῦ τετιμημένος—διάκονος λειτουργεῖτω αὐτῷ ἀμέμπτως—A. C. ii. 26, p. 43.

παντεπόπτη τέκοντι—S. Greg. Ren. p. 88.

τὸν παντεπόπτην Θεὸν—Alex. Jac. Pat. Ren. p. 443.

δι' αὐτοῦ—εἰς λαὸν περιούσιον—A. C. vii. 36, p. 178.

This runs in the liturgical form : μεγαλοπρεπὲς ἅγιον ὄνομα—S. Greg. Ren. p. 87.

δὰ τὸ ὄνομά σου τὸ ἅγιον, τὸ ἐπικληθὲν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς—S. Greg. Ren. p. 103.

εἰς εὐαρέστησιν—S. Bas. Ren. pp. 58, 79, and elsewhere.

καὶ σοι πρέπει πᾶσα δόξα, μεγαλοσύνη, κράτος τε καὶ ἐξουσία—S. Greg. Ren. p. 109.

of an examination into these points in a Note,¹ setting the words of S. Clement side by side with the passages which illustrate them. From this our readers will see that the new portion of the Epistle

¹ S. CLEMENT.

§ 57. Closing sentence and first of the newly-discovered portion of Epistle : ἡσυχάσει ἀφόβως ἀπὸ παντὸς κακοῦ.

§ 58 : τῷ παναγίῳ καὶ ἐνδόξῳ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ.

ζῆ γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς καὶ ζῆ ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον (quoted in 1st Notice).

δεδομένα δικαίωματα καὶ προστάγματα.

ἐλλόγιμος. Cf. § 44 and A.C. ii. 1, p. 13. ἔμπειρος τοῦ λόγου : the writer, who is using S. Clement, apparently taking the word in Philo's sense.

εἰς τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν σωζομένων.

§ 59 : ἀθῶοι ἐσόμεθα ἀπὸ ταύτης τῆς ἁμαρτίας.

αἰτησόμεθα.

ἐκτενῆ τὴν δέησιν καὶ ἱκεσίαν ποιούμενοι. Cf. § 34 : βοήσωμεν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐκτενώς.

ὥπως τὸν ἀριθμὸν—τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν αὐτοῦ διαφυλάξῃ.

ὁ δημιουργὸς τῶν πάντων.

διὰ τῆς ἡγαπημένου παιδὸς.

εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν δόξης ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ.

ἀρχέγονον πάσης κτίσεως ὄνομα.

ἀνοίξας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τῆς καρδίας. Cf. §§ 19, 36 : τοῖς ὀμμασι τῆς ψυχῆς.

LITURGIES, &c.

Thought of ἡσυχάσει in all Liturgies, e.g. ἡρεμον καὶ ἡσυχίῳ βίον—S. Mark. Renaud (2nd ed.) p. 135, and in other Liturgies.

τῷ παναγίῳ σου ὀνόματι—S. Mark. Ren. p. 137. τῷ ἐνδόξῳ σου ὀνόματι—S. Chrys. Lit. vol. 5, p. 525. τὸ πανάγιον καὶ ἐνδοξον—Ephr. Chers. de Mir. S. Clem. § 5.

ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ Κλήμης ἀρχαιώτερον, Ζῆ, φησιν, ὁ Θ. κ. τ. λ.—S. Bas. de Spir. Sanct. § 29.

τὰ προστάγματα αὐτοῦ καὶ δικαίωματα—A.C. viii. 6, 1, p. 198, Ueltzen and elsewhere.

Not in LXX. or N. T. Not uncommon in Philo.

τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν σωζομένων—A. C. viii. 5, p. 196, and v. 15, p. 119.

ἀθώωσον αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ πάσης συνειδήσεως πονηρῶν—S. Greg. Ren. p. 111.

Common in Liturgies.

ἐκτενώς ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἱκετεύσωμεν—A. C. viii. 6, 1, p. 198. ἐκτενώς ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν δεηθώμεν—A. C. viii. 6, 4, p. 199.

τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν σου διαφυλάττων—A. C. viii. 22, p. 220.

A. C. viii. 12, 10, p. 209, and elsewhere, and in Philo.

A. C. viii. 5, 3, p. 196, and elsewhere.

εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς σῆς δόξης καὶ τοῦ ὀνόματός σου—A. C. viii. 11, 1, p. 204.

ἀρχέγονος found in Philo, Iren., Bas., Greg. Naz., Cyr. Jerus., Did., Chrys., &c. Cf. πρωτότοκον πάσης κτίσεως, common in the Liturgies.

The notion in all its forms very common in Philo and the Liturgies, e.g. διανοίξῃ τὰ ὄρα τῶν καρδιῶν—A. C. viii. 6, p. 198. φωτίσῃ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τῆς καρδίας—A. C. vii. 39, p. 182.

meets the above-noted requirements pretty fully. It does bear some witness to Philo, it is itself witnessed to by succeeding writings, and specially by the Liturgies, and thus the liturgical character of the Epistle, as a whole, is brought into great prominence. We need not be surprised at this. The limits of this notice do not allow us to discuss the question at length. We may fairly say, however, that it would seem evident that the Liturgies, in the form in which we have them, could not have been the product of the age to which, from internal evidence, we conclude that they, in part at least, belong. As

S. Clement (continued).

τὸν μόνον ὕψιστον ἐν ὑψίστοις, ἅγιον
ἐν ἁγίοις ἀναπανόμενον.

τὸν ποιοῦντα ταπεινοὺς εἰς ὕψος καὶ
τοὺς ὑψηλοὺς ταπεινοῦντα, τὸν πλουτί-
ζοντα καὶ πτωχίζοντα, τὸν ἀποκτείνοντα
καὶ ζῆν ποιοῦντα.

μόνον εὐεργέτην.

τὸν ἐπιβλέποντα ἐν ταῖς ἀβύσσοις.

τὸν τῶν ἀπηλπισμένων σωτῆρα.

ἐπίσκοπον (of God).

ἀξιούμεν, Δέσποτα, βοήθην γένεσθαι
καὶ ἀντιλήπτορα ἡμῶν—τοὺς πεπτωκό-
τας ἔγειρον—τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς ἴασαι· τοὺς
πλανωμένους τοῦ λαοῦ σου ἐπίστρε-
ψον· χόρτασον τοὺς πεινῶντας· λύ-
τρωσαι τοὺς δεσμίους ἡμῶν—παρακά-
λεσον τοὺς ὀλιγοψυχούντας.

§ 60: ἀέναν τοῦ κόσμου σύστασιν
διὰ τῶν ἐνεργουμένων ἐφανερποίησας.
Cf. § 20: ἀενοαὶ τε πηγαί.

ἐλεῆμον καὶ οὐκτιρμον.

ναὶ, Δέσποτα, ἐπίφανον τὸ πρόσω-
πόν σου ἐφ' ἡμᾶς εἰς ἀγαθὰ ἐν εἰρήνῃ.

εἰς τὸ σκεπασθῆναι ἡμᾶς τῇ χειρὶ σου
τῇ κραταῖᾳ καὶ μυσθῆναι ἀπὸ πάσης

Liturgies, &c. (continued).

ὁ μόνος ὕψιστος—*A. C. viii. 5, p. 129.* ὕψιστε ὁ ἐν ὑψηλοῖς κατοικῶν, ἅγιε ἐν ἁγίοις ἀναπανόμενε—*A. C. viii. 11, p. 204.* ὁ ἅγιος καὶ ἁγίοις ἀναπανόμενος—*Did. de Trin. 3, 13; Migne, p. 861.*

ἀφ' οὗ δὲ ὁ πτωχίζων καὶ πλουτίζων Θεός, ὁ θανατῶν καὶ ζωογονῶν—ὁ ἀναλαμβάνων πρὸς εἰς ὕψος καὶ ταπεινῶν ἀμαρτωλοὺς ἕως γῆς—*S. Greg. Naz. Orat. 42, 5; Migne, p. 464.*

εὐεργέτην (of God)—*Philo, and Lit. ἐπιβλέπων ἀβύσσους—Did. de Trin. 2, 1, p. 448.*

ἡ ἐλπίς τῶν ἀπελπισμένων—*S. Mark. Ren. p. 133.*

ἐπίσκοπε πάσης σαρκὸς—*S. Mark. Ren. p. 133.*

ἀξιούμεν σε—ὅπως γένη βοήθης καὶ ἀντιλήπτορ—*A. C. viii. 12 and 13, pp. 213, 215, and elsewhere.* λύτρωσαι δεσμίους· πεινῶντας χόρτασον, ὀλιγοψυχούντας παρακάλεσον, πεπλανημένους ἐπίστρεψον—πεπτωκότας ἔγειρον—νεοσκηκίτας ἴασαι—*S. Mark. Ren. p. 138.*

ἀέναν in Liturgies, and see Note 1, p. 239. ὁ τὴν τοῦ κόσμου σύστασιν διὰ τῶν ἐνεργουμένων φανεροποιήσας—*A. C. viii. 22, p. 220.* τὸ θέλημα—τῇ δυνάμει τῶν ἐνεργουμένων ἐφανερῶδη—*Greg. Nyss. Hex. p. 69; Migne.*

Common combination in Liturgies, e.g. *S. Mark. Ren. p. 126*; also in *Philo*.

ναὶ common in Liturgies. Δέσποτα—ἐπίφανον τὸ πρόσωπόν σου ἐπὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον τοῦτον—*S. Mark. Ren. p. 130.* Cf. *A. C. viii. 18, viii. 37, pp. 218, 230.* ἐν εἰρήνῃ, common in Liturgies and in *Philo*.

διαφylaχθῆναι ὑπὸ τῇ ἁγίᾳ καὶ κραταίᾳ χεὶρὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ σκεπασ-

well might we say that our own Liturgy is the product of A.D. 1662. The New Testament itself gives some well-known indications of a Liturgy. Succeeding writers,¹ e.g. Justin Martyr and Irenæus, supply further indications. S. Clement² himself supplies some. How could it be otherwise? In questions of this kind one is apt to

S. Clement (continued.)

ἁμαρτίας—καὶ ῥύσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τῶν
μισούντων ἡμᾶς ἀδικῶς.

§ 61 : οἷς δὸς, Κύριε, ὑγίαν, εἰρή-
νην, ὁμόνοιαν, εὐστάθειαν. Cf. § 60 :
δὸς ὁμόνοιαν καὶ εἰρήνην.

Δέσποτα, ἐπουράνιε βασιλεῦ τῶν
αἰώνων.

ἐξομολογούμεθα.

διὰ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως.

καὶ προστάτον—Cf. §§ 36, 64.

§ 62 : εἰς ἐναρέτον βίον.

ὁμονοούντας ἀμνησικάκως. Cf. § 2.

ἐγκεκυφῶσιν εἰς τὰ λόγια.

§ 63 : ἔντευξιν ἣν ἐποιησάμεθα περὶ
εἰρήνης καὶ ὁμόνοιας.

ἐπέμψαμεν δὲ ἄνδρας πιστοὺς καὶ
σώφρονες, ἀπὸ νεότητος ἀναστραφέν-
τας εὐς γήρους ἀμέμπτως ἐν ἡμῖν, οἵτι-
νες μάρτυρες ἔσονται μεταξὺ ὑμῶν καὶ
ἡμῶν. Cf. § 44.

¹ *Just. Mart. Apol.* i. 65, 66, 67, pp. 85, 86. (*Maran.*) *Iren. contr.*
Har. iv. 18, 5 ; i. 13, 2 ; and *Fragm.* 38.

² *Clem.* i. 40, 41. The words, § 63, κατὰ τὴν ἔντευξιν ἣν ἐποιησάμεθα
περὶ εἰρήνης καὶ ὁμόνοιας ἐν τῇδε τῇ ἐπιστολῇ, which have a thorough litur-

Liturgies, &c. (continued.)

θῆναι ἀπὸ παντὸς πονηροῦ—*Jac. Pat.*
Alex. Ren. p. 457. ῥύσθητι αὐτοὺς
ἀπὸ πάσης ἀσεβείας—*A. C.* viii. 6, p.
198. ῥύσθητι ἐκ τῶν μισούντων—
Did. Eb. Ps. 17, 16, p. 1249. ὑπὲρ
τῶν μισούντων ἡμᾶς—*A. C.* viii. 12,
p. 213, and elsewhere.

Thoroughly liturgical, and such
combinations common. See *Ren.*
pp. 60, 82, 121, 132, &c. εἰρήνην,
εὐστάθειαν, common combinations
in *Philo*.

Δέσποτα, κύριε, παντόκρατορ, ἐπου-
ράνιε βασιλεῦ—*S. Mark. Ren.* p. 140,
and cf. *Gloria in Excelsis*.

Common in Liturgies.

Common in Liturgies.

Not in LXX. or N. T. In *Philo*,
A. C. viii. 39, p. 231, and else-
where.

εἰς ἐναρέτον βίον—*Philo ex Joh.*
Dam. vol. 2, p. 648 : *Mangey* ; and
Greg. Nyss. in *Cant. Cant.* p. 757 :
Migne. Cf. ἐναρέτου ζωῆς—*Did.*
Exp. Ps. vi. 6, p. 1177. ἐναρέτως
βιῶν—*J. Mart. Apol.* 2, 9, p. 98.

Idea in all Liturgies. *E.g.* χάρισαι
—τῆς θανατηφόρου μνησικακίας—*S.*
Bas. Ren. p. 62 (bis). *S. Greg.*
Ren. pp. 91, 92, and elsewhere.

εἰς ἃς εἰς ἐγκύπτει—*Polyc. Phil.*
3. παρακύναι common in Litu-
rgies.

ἔντευξιν—*Alex. Jac. Pat. Ren.* p.
446. Cf. *Clem.* 2, 19. δεσθῶμεν ὑπὲρ
τῆς εἰρήνης, ὁμόνοιας—*Id.* pp. 450,
456.

διὰ τῆς νεότητος ἐν πραύτητι καὶ
εὐταξίᾳ γήρας ἐπιδεικνύμενος· δοκι-
μασθεῖς, εἰ ὑπὸ πάντων οὕτως μαρτυ-
ρεῖται—*A. C.* ii. 2, p. 13, and cf.
A. C. viii. 4 and 5.

lose sight of time, and to forget that when our Epistle was written a Liturgy of some sort, however brief and simple, had been in daily use for at least fifty years. Out of some primitive Liturgy (in use if not in writing) S. Clement might well have taken some things, into which again much of his language might have become incorporated. Why should we be thought to be over-credulous, if we believe that our Epistle contains some portion of those prayers to which S. Paul's 'unlearned' man said 'Amen,' and a still larger portion of those supplications, to which Justin Martyr says that the people responded. Perhaps we have in this liturgical character of our Epistle one special reason for its general and quasi-canonical acceptance. One can understand why the early Church should cling, with what might seem to us an almost extravagant fondness, to a writing which supplied her with at least a portion of her public prayer.

With respect also to the words and expressions which in course of time acquired liturgical or canonical importance, there must needs have been a time when they were first employed, and a source from which they were taken. From what source would they be more likely to be taken than from our Epistle? The growth of them into a definite use must have been very gradual. Traces of this gradual process we seem to see in the use of some words, e.g., of ἀναπέμειν by Justin Martyr in a passage already noted, while sometimes he uses πέμπειν; of ἐπίκλησις by Irenæus,¹ who in one passage uses this technical word, while in another he uses ἑκκλησις, as though the special force of ἐπίκλησις had not then been gained for it exclusively. We might notice ἀπαγγέλλειν used by Clement² in such a way as to suggest a liturgical force, and which Irenæus seems to give to it, but giving way in the Liturgies to the καταγγέλλειν of S. Paul. Or we might refer to συντελεῖν with εὐχῆς of Justin Martyr³ instead of the technical ἐπιτελεῖν, as though that technical use had not then been definitely settled.

As the sum of our remarks upon the Epistle, now happily completed⁴ for us by the newly discovered MS., it would appear *certain* that some portion of the ancient Liturgies is at least as old as the time of S. Clement, and *probable* that some portion is of a still earlier date. A critical comparison of the Epistle with the Liturgies will, we believe, throw further light upon these interesting questions; and before long this fuller investigation must be undertaken.

gical ring in them, may well point to some Liturgy from which the ἔντευξις was taken.

¹ See Note 1, p. 245, and cf. ἐκκαλοῦμεν in *Fragm.* 38.

² ὅπως θάττον—εἰρήνην καὶ ὁμόνοιαν ἀπαγγέλλωσιν—*Clem.* i. § 65.

³ See Note 1, p. 245.

⁴ S. Irenæus, iii. 3, 3, speaks of a writing sent by the Church of Rome, in the time of S. Clement, to the Corinthians, as preserving the Apostolic tradition—'annuntiantem unum Deum . . . qui ignem præparaverit diabolo et angelis ejus.' There is nothing in the 1st Ep., even as we have it now, which answers to this description. Since, however, the 2nd Ep. may be held to justify the language of S. Irenæus, we hazard the conjecture that the writing (ἱκανωτάτην γραφήν), which is not said to be by the pen of S. Clement, included the 2nd Epistle.

Catholic Eschatology and Universalism. An Essay on the Doctrine of Future Retribution. By HENRY NUTCOMBE OXENHAM, M.A., Author of 'The Catholic Doctrine of the Atonement' &c. (London : Basil Montagu Pickering, 1876.)

THIS little volume, the fruit of a recent controversy, recapitulates with care the arguments by which the doctrine it defends is usually supported. Its author's contribution—and it is an important one—consists mainly of a re-statement of the argument in the form of an able and scholarly, if not absolutely exhaustive, manual of what is to be said on the orthodox side. Should there be any who remain unconvinced, it will be for lack of common ground between it and them on which to come to a parley.

We fear it must be said that Universalism is a fashionable heresy. The feelings of modern society have grown very susceptible, and it shrinks from aught unpleasant. This thought of a possible coming existence of penal suffering *is* unpleasant; it is peculiarly so to the *jeunesse dorée* of a life carefully shielded from the slightest physical discomfort; it is an intruder unwelcome to the entire and large class of whom Dives is the representative, and as such, its banishment, first from the religion of polite society, and then from all religion whatever, is earnestly desired.

The lack of earnestness of our generation affects this doctrine in another way as well; because its tendency is to resolve faiths into philosophies, and to dally with all, whilst committing itself to none. Modern society does not believe, it only simulates belief; and the doctrine in question refuses to be refined away into an abstract idea. It must be either true or false, and forces you to commit yourself to an 'aye' or a 'no.'

It follows, therefore, that subterfuges of many kinds are employed to break the force of the evidence to the truth of the doctrine, and permit men to disbelieve it. One school insists that the love of God is so great that He will never condemn any soul to eternal doom; whilst they drop out of sight the correlative and complementary truths that He is justice as well as goodness; and, secondly, that every soul condemned has practically pronounced the sentence upon itself. Another school tortures the words of the Scripture into a semblance of agreement with the Universalist doctrine; whilst a third finds the only escape from the inevitable conclusion from which they so shrink in an entirely gratuitous hypothesis of the utter extinction of souls, against which all analogy, in agreement with every human instinct, loudly protests.

Besides this, it is only candid to acknowledge that some of the roots of the Universalist doctrine are of a far different and nobler kind. Every Christian not a Calvinist must believe that the Divine Creator formed each creature for an existence of goodness and happiness. If a struggle has arisen between Good and Evil, for the possession, temporal and final, of the souls of men, it is hard indeed to conceive for a single moment, of Almighty Power and Goodness being worsted in the struggle. Thence the strong inclination to

believe in a final restoration of all souls to their pristine purity, and in the final defeat and extinction of Evil.

The consequence is that this question runs up finally into the ancient *crux*, that origin and existence of Evil, whose solution, so far as it is attainable at all, must probably be sought for in the nature and freedom of the created will, which is capable, if it so choose, of generating evil by its own action.

In what we have said above, we have, as we conceive, been supplying an omission in the treatise before us. Mr. H. N. Oxenham has treated with much care the witness of Tradition and that of Scripture. In each he is, as might reasonably have been expected, thoroughly successful in showing that the Scriptures teach, and that the Primitive Church held, the punishment of the wicked no less than the blessedness of the saints, to be eternal. In truth, everybody not wilfully blind must at once acknowledge this. But he has not, we think, treated the argument from reason with the elaborateness which the case demands. For it is to be noted, that the grand assault upon the doctrine is made from this side, and upon grounds of reason : from this side, therefore, and upon grounds of reason also, it must be met. And it certainly seems to us, that *given* the soul on its probation, given the persistency (as we know it, and the continually accumulating force) of mental and spiritual habits ; given the continuance of the great moral laws upon which the universe is administered by its Divine Creator ; some such doctrine as that of the continuity of retribution follows ; and we fail to see how any other conclusion is possible. It is an opinion to which the mind feels itself inevitably pushed with reluctance, and almost with regret. For where is the stop to be put in the downward course ? At what point in the process of increasing degradation of a sinful being is it conceivable that its development should take an entirely new and reversed direction ? It must not be gratuitously and suddenly taken ; that would be opposed to all our experience of orderly causation. It must be consequent upon some exertion of spiritual force so great as to overcome the resistance, however great it might be, of a soul steeped *ex hypothesi* in sin, and thus apparently to destroy its free will and reduce it to a lower rank. It may indeed be argued that it would be preferable to be happy under these conditions than to be miserable under the conditions of freedom and self-determination. But it must be further pointed out that the supposed extinguishment of free will would involve a positive incapacity for goodness, because goodness implies previous free choice, and cannot exist without it. It would seem further that *thus* the gate would be closed against any reception of the Beatific Vision, and therefore against eternal happiness in the proper sense in which the idea belongs to the soul of man.

We are led, therefore, to the conclusion that the matter is only really arguable on the rational ground, and that this section is somewhat inadequate in Mr. Oxenham's treatise. Within the limits that remain, the treatise is a powerful and complete statement of the argument.

Some few words may be said upon an *obiter dictum*, whereby Mr. Oxenham, accepting a challenge made by Mr. Jukes, argues from the literal interpretation of our Lord's words respecting the state of the wicked to the literal interpretation of His words respecting the Eucharist, *i.e.* to Transubstantiation. We must be pardoned for reminding Mr. Oxenham that the argument from the one case to the other is altogether illicit; and that because our Lord's words are *sometimes* to be understood literally, it by no means follows that they *always* are. We can scarcely imagine that so keen a logician as Mr. Oxenham should not have perceived the utterly baseless nature of the argument. The fact is, that the subject of Transubstantiation is dragged in, both here and in the lengthy appendix, where it has no business. Mr. Oxenham has been uttering his mind upon a subject which has much occupied it; or he has seized upon the opportunity to recommend to Anglicans a favourite view. One or other motive has brought in this elaborate disquisition where it had no connexion with the subject. As it is here, however, we will say the few words about it for which alone we have space.

It appears that to Mr. Oxenham's mind, the Real Presence and Transubstantiation are convertible terms. But that is only so because he insists upon *defining* the *mode* of the Presence. There is no necessity to do this. It is precisely this which the Roman Church has done, and the Anglican refuses to do. To our minds it is by no means a fatal objection that our theory of the Presence is (if it so be, which we do not at this moment allow) intellectually inconceivable (p. 106). Suppose we should retort that the doctrine of the Trinity, which he holds equally with ourselves, is 'intellectually inconceivable?' The real fact is that every mystery of the Faith is in some way or other 'intellectually inconceivable.' To our mind it is rather an objection than not to Transubstantiation, that it substitutes a material hypothesis perfectly level to the understanding for the mystery apprehended by Faith, while it remains perfectly incapable notwithstanding of logical proof; and is suspended between Faith and Reason, like Mahomet's coffin was said to be between two magnets.¹ We do not say but that orthodox belief in the Real Presence, if peremptorily forced into a rigid theory, might naturally fall into the shape of Transubstantiation. That would be our very nearest approach to the Roman doctrine. We should hold it to be a thousandfold safer not to define it at all. No such process is attempted with other dogmas. We do not try to define the *mode of existence* of the Divine Persons in the Holy Trinity. We do not decide authoritatively upon the *mode* in which the human soul comes into existence, and the controversy between Creationism and Traducianism is unsettled to this day. Why should we do so in the case of the Eucharist? And the objection to do so is the stronger, because in so doing we ignorantly intrude into a province of thought concerning which we know next to nothing. As

¹ The peculiarity of matters of faith is to present some degree of difficulty to their acceptance. Were there no difficulty, there would be no scope for the exercise of faith. It is permitted to the believer to say with Tertullian, '*Credo quia impossibile.*'

Mr. Oxenham allows, in words quoted from Dr. Newman, 'it (*i.e.* the Roman doctrine) deals with what no one on earth knows anything about, the material substances themselves'—(p. 165.) Why then go out of your way to say anything about them, and more especially when in doing so you must (as will be readily allowed) go so far beyond the revelation made in Scripture?

All this, however, had really nothing whatever to do with the main subject of Mr. Oxenham's book : and we think it would have been better to bring it forward at a more suitable time. Within its proper limit, the treatise is, as we have said, admirable.

On the Scientific Conclusions and Theological Inferences of a Work entitled 'The Unseen Universe, or Physical Speculations of a Future State.' By the Rev. W. J. IRONS, D.D., Prebendary of St. Paul's, Bampton Lecturer, &c., for 1870. (London : Published for the [Victoria] Institute. Hardwicke and Bogue. Parker. London and Oxford, 1876.)

THIS pamphlet is itself a review ; and it is a model of conscientious and painstaking reviewing. The work which is its subject is actually gone over carefully three full times. First, it gives an 'Introductory Sketch,' which is really a *précis* of the entire work. Then come the chapters in detail, so handled as to show the drift of the arguments, what they establish and what they do not, but still avoiding comment or criticism. Lastly, we have the review proper, on which we must make a few remarks. We have our doubts whether, on the whole, Dr. Irons has quite given the book the credit it deserves ; and for this reason :—Its authors profess to approach moral conclusions from the scientific side ; on which Dr. Irons sets upon their work, points out various *gaps* in its conclusions—sundry divergences from the Christian Faith, indicated more or less clearly—and complains that it does not teach a complete gospel. Quite true ; but the question is, Did it ever profess to do so ? It does not, apparently, occur with quite sufficient force to Dr. Irons that the remarkable fact about the book is, not that we cannot reach the *whole* of Christian Faith by the tracks thus indicated by science, but that we can reach *so much* : not that science does not guide us to the complete Creed, but that she hints and suggests any part of it. The laudable attempt of the 'authors is to reach theological truths by scientific processes, and to express them when reached in scientific terms. The attempt seems to us to have been, considering all things, surprisingly successful. Is it quite worth while to find fault with it because of the imperfection of its results ? We can hardly think so ; and still less can we adopt the conclusion that the said results are radically incompatible with the Christian Faith. Imperfect they must be from the nature of the case, rough-hewn and awkwardly worded, because stated in an unfamiliar dialect—language scientific instead of language theological, as if Greek should be translated into Chinese ; erroneous perhaps in detail, from the writers' evident unfamiliarity with scientific theology. So much we can allow ; but no more ; and we take all this to be the merest of trifles

beside the significant fact, that science is at length beginning to trace out *her separate pathway* by which men may ascend to God. That, to our mind, is the great merit, amidst some grave errors, of the work on the *Unseen Universe*. But if the work of fault-finding was to be done at all, it could not have been done more gently and kindly than Dr. Irons has done it; nor, as we may add, with so much of singular faculty for abstract and metaphysical thought. And, after all, while noting 'much that is unsatisfactory,' he acknowledges that we have by means of the book 'turned a corner in a tiresome controversial by-way,' and that, in his own eloquent words, an 'open and unreserved rejection of Abiogenesis,—their feeling after an Ontology and Theology, as a kind of need of all ultimate thought,—their detection of the ultimate boundary, and the *look beyond*: all these constitute this work as a definite gain to truth'—(p. 46.) So that we do not think the authors of the work have, after all, much reason to complain of him, though we, as his critics, may.

One or two points of detail in his argument seem to require especial notice. We do not feel so sure as Dr. Irons that the authors of the *Unseen Universe* were absolutely wrong in suggesting that the Divine Son is, in some mysterious way, conditioned, and thus peculiarly adapted for manifesting the Divine Father in the various relations between God and man. We desire to speak with diffidence, as is but proper. But if it be true (and the authors of the *Unseen Universe* are unimpeachable witnesses on that point) that science points, in however vague a way, to some such conclusion, surely there are some indications in Holy Scripture which look in the same direction. Such statements as are several times repeated in Holy Scripture, that the 'Divine Father dwells in the Light that no man can approach unto,' 'Whom no man hath seen, nor can see;' then the second set of facts, that all the Angelology of the Old Testament points to constant appearances of God Himself in human form, and as having thus entered into the sphere of the Conditioned; that by the Son the Divine Father 'made the worlds;' that when the human race had fallen into sin, the Divine plan of salvation was that He should be Incarnated, and pass through the entire circle of existence in the Conditioned, and (as it would seem) a certain peculiarity of relation between Him and the Creation, or (even) degree of sponsorship and responsibility for it, is thereby shadowed forth; and then the express statement that it is He, and no other, who will judge the world of moral beings at the last; and, finally, the mysterious declaration (whatever it may point to) that the Divine Son shall render up his delegated kingdom again unto the Father, which perhaps points dimly to the mystical fact—a fact altogether inappreciable in its bearings by human faculties—that as out of the Absolute all things proceed, so into the Absolute all things return; surely each of these different indications points to a Conditionment in time of the Divine Son, and that for the purpose of being the Creator of a sentient and moral race of beings, as he became afterwards its Saviour! Not *eternally* Conditioned indeed, because the creative work would seem not to have been eternally going on—we fully agree with Dr. Irons in this: but here we stop.

We have said enough if we have vindicated this suggestion from the scientific side as exceedingly important ; and while vague and inaccurate, as was to be expected, as by no means necessarily inconsistent with the Faith.

Among many interesting questions touched by Dr. Irons with force and suggestiveness, if just a shade too dogmatically, we select one on which the *Church Quarterly* has had occasion recently to pronounce—the question of Miracles. He breaks loose entirely from the evidential view of them. According to his idea, they are just an additional weight for Revelation to carry, and without force as evidence at all. Indeed his argument seems to reach as far as to deny that any one religious (or other?) fact can properly ‘prove’ any other fact. ‘Miracles prove themselves,’ he says ; which he must mean for paradox :

‘Revelation must prove itself ; and Christ in saying, “Except ye see signs and wonders ye will not believe,” rebukes the thought that a high faith, as an inference, must come from seeing miracles ; much less from proving historically that other people saw them 1800 years ago’—(p. 49.)

Very true ; but then why were they worked ? They clearly have, or at least *had*, a function ; we should be inclined to say *had* : for since miracles have ceased for many ages, the probable inference is, that their peculiar function is inoperative for the time ; but what *was* that function ?

And the incompleteness of Dr. Irons’ view is shown in that it has apparently no answer to give. But he has expressed himself so briefly, and the entire occasion was clearly a subordinate one, that he has not fully expressed his view, and we may be doing him an injustice. In any case, our space is exhausted.

Priesthood in the Light of the New Testament. The Congregational Union Lecture for 1876. By E. MELLOR, D.D. (Hodder and Stoughton.)

THESE Lectures are, as may be imagined, a manifesto alike against the idea of an Apostolic Ministry, and every one of its manifestations. Wherever the lecturer makes mention of a priest or of priesthood, it is to pour out upon it the vials of his wrath in plentiful showers. It is a perversion of the Scriptures, it is an anachronism, it is a superstition ; the Sacraments are ‘acts of manual thaumaturgy.’

‘Never was heard such a terrible curse !
But what gave rise to some little surprise,
Nobody seemed one penny the worse !’

Seriously speaking, the doctrine of the Priesthood cannot expect to be treated better than the Christian religion itself. And we hear exactly the same epithets very commonly applied to the latter by adherents of rationalistic principles of criticism only one step more thoroughgoing than Dr. Mellor. A Christianity without its supernatural element of miracle and mystery, what Mr. Matthew Arnold calls its *Aberglaube*, would be comparatively a poor thing. And it is precisely

this element in the Ministry and the Sacraments which the present author tries, with small success, to eliminate.

It is altogether a preliminary begging of the question, when he lays down that a formal statement of the doctrine, if a true one, ought to be found in the New Testament. Fairly construed, there is a far more distinct recognition of a priesthood in the sacred writings than could properly have been expected beforehand. The Gospels are historical, and treat of a period anterior to the foundation of the Church, yet they contain the express statement of a priesthood in the Church. The majority of the Epistles are hortatory as a rule; they scarcely contain more than one or two *formal* statements of doctrine from one end to the other. Their references to doctrine, their appeals to it for practical purposes, are indeed numerous; but then there are quite as many references to the doctrine of the Priesthood as to any other doctrine, excepting only, perhaps, the Incarnation and the Atonement. Dr. Mellor denounces the Priesthood on grounds which would render it impossible to demonstrate the doctrine of the Trinity, or the work of the Holy Ghost.

After all, he is forced to acknowledge that up to the very earliest date to which he can look back, he finds a Priesthood existing, whose claims and whose duties were identical with that which exists now. What that really is, Dr. Mellor does not seem to have a very accurate idea. Like many controversialists, his heated imagination has led him far astray. He has raised a phantom, that he may be thought to have the honour of laying it. No one really imagines that personal and inward holiness is unimportant in the priest of to-day, provided that his ordination be valid, any more than they could be dispensed with in the case of an Apostle. No one really supposes that the absolution of the priest is an unquestionable passport to heaven, irrespective of any inner fitness in the recipient, and such like. These things are not parts of the doctrine of the Priesthood; they are ignorant and fallacious inferences from it; and by adopting them, in a great measure, the present writer only shows his misunderstanding of what that doctrine is. His allegation, in a subsequent part of the work, that if the χάρισμα of Apostolic grace did once exist, the succession can be shown not to have been preserved, is of the same shallow and *ad captandum* character. We regret to witness such a display of violent prejudice and imperfect information in lectures which appear to have a representative and official character.

John the Baptist; a Contribution to Christian Evidences. The Congregational Union Lectures for 1874. By HENRY ROBERT REYNOLDS, D.D. Second Edition. (Hodder and Stoughton.)

THERE is a certain sense in which everything is related to everything else; but life would be too short to trace out all the connections. Too strong a sense of these remoter relations impairs a writer's grasp of present facts; and this exactly describes Dr. Reynolds' error in the work before us. S. John Baptist is one of the grandest figures who have ever moved upon this world's stage, and his position as

standing between the Jewish and the Christian dispensations is absolutely unique. But we know comparatively little about him. The materials extant are but scanty for a Life. Accordingly Dr. Reynolds has eked them out by a very miscellaneous collection of extraneous matter, and made a book up mainly of the discussion of side issues. What is said, and often very truly and well, respecting the subject of the work, is embedded in a mosaic of theories, historical and theological. Now, we suppose it really is historically certain that S. John Baptist was neither a Congregationalist nor yet a Plymouth Brother. Why, then, should he be made the occasion for all these outbursts of sectarian polemic, which go far to render a work with many good qualities unsuitable for the use of Churchmen? A book should not be polemical in intention when it is biographical in form.

The style is somewhat too diffuse and wordy, ornamented and rhetorical, occasionally beyond what the subject demands. But we willingly accord to the lecturer the praise of considerable industry and of historical grasp. If his portraiture is indistinct, it is because it is seen through a cloud of so many things that had little connexion with its subject. But it is not sketchy nor is it inaccurate. It is the inferences which he draws that are objectionable, not his presentment of the facts themselves.

Perhaps the seventh lecture, on the 'Ministry of the Prison,' is the most satisfactory; less inflated in style, more constant to a single purpose, and weightier with thought than other sections of the work. But we cannot agree with the writer in his estimate of the motives that prompted S. John's message to our Lord, 'Art Thou He that should come?' In his zeal to save the prophet's reputation, he will have it that he was doubtful whether some new manifestation had not become necessary for the completion of the Messianic ideal. And he appeals to the 'spirit of a martyr, the self-repression of an ascetic, the dogged obstinacy of a Nazarite, and a Hebrew prophet's sublime carelessness of personal comfort,' to negative the idea that a long imprisonment had somewhat overclouded the Baptist's faith. Surely our Lord's answering message, closing with 'Blessed is he whosoever shall not be offended in Me,' points to quite a different significance in the question; and why should not the physical depression of close confinement reacting on the mind and spirit have been the cause? Every one knows how depressing lengthened confinement is. Prisoners in the gaols are found to need the counter-acting stimulus of an increased dietary. S. John Baptist was a man of simple habits, an ascetic,—true; but he was also and emphatically a man of the open air, free as a wild bird to come and go. From his childhood he had been 'in the deserts,' those wide plains east of Jordan. In the narrow dungeon of Machærus he must have drooped like a caged eagle; and in this depression the mind's vision was not so clear. This mode of accounting for the question is at all events simpler than Dr. Reynolds' view. Similarly we must differ from him in his view of *βίαιαι*—*violent*. Surely we may follow Chrysostom, Basil, Gregory, Ambrose, and a host of Fathers, who take the *violence* to be the earnestness of strong desire.

Dr. Reynolds drags in his taunt at the Church, as he is too fond of doing such matters, by the head and shoulders. Other parts of this lecture are excellent. The description of the plot of Herodias and the scene with Salome in the banquet-hall is described with singular power. It is a fact worth remembering for evidential purposes, that the intense respect and affection with which the Baptist was regarded as the last and greatest of the prophets, *did not avail to create a mythical legend of his resurrection.* And yet the dramatic, sensational manner of his death, it might be thought, would have provoked such a legend. The eighth lecture, in which the writer sums up the results of the Baptist's ministry, may be recommended as an able statement of facts; and though we should doubt whether the Forerunner's conceptions, and motives, and hopes took the shape which they assume in Dr. Reynolds' smooth and mellifluous rhetoric, the lecture may be consulted with advantage for its painstaking analysis of the tendencies which, as the writer supposes, underlay the Baptist's faith, and tended to shape his teaching. We wish, by-the-by, that he would not speak (as he constantly does) of the Baptist's teaching and so on, as *Johannine*. That term is by usage appropriated to S. John Evangelist, and one has to think every time who is meant.

On the whole, this is an able and scholarly course of lectures. We could wish them to be half as long, and to have all the debateable matter excised. They would then be a very acceptable gift to the Church at large.

Missions in India: the System of Education in Government and Mission Schools Contrasted. By Lieutenant-General C. W. TREMENHEERE, C.B. (Henry S. King and Co.)

GENERAL TREMENHEERE has done a public service by the pamphlet to which we here draw attention. To those who are practically acquainted with the subject of Indian Mission schools, what he has written will be neither surprising nor new; but he has rightly judged that there is a great lack of accurate information in England about the system on which Missions, and especially Mission schools, are carried on, and he has brought together a formidable array of facts and figures in support of the position taken up by the late Bishop of Bombay—with which it is well known that the late Metropolitan of India mainly agreed—in a remarkable series of papers published in the *Indian Church Gazette*.

Starting with Sir Bartle Frere's statement, that 'everything in India is in a state of revolution,' General Tremeneheere asks whether education will meet the crisis. Contrasting the system of education in Government and Mission schools, he shows that, as judged by the test of open scholarships and University examinations, the former are far more efficient than the latter, and that while Mission schools cost the various Missionary Bodies about 70,000*l.* a year, Government might do the whole work by an extra expenditure of 82,000*l.* in addition to the 997,080*l.* now spent on education, 204,004*l.* of which is given in grants to aided schools. He then contends (1) that even on the ground of morality Government schools are to be pre-

ferred, inasmuch as in Mission schools, owing to the paucity of Christian children (about four out of every 150 of those under instruction throughout India), the *ḥṭoc* of the schools must be heathen, and therefore injurious to such children; and (2) that the agencies for giving religious instruction are very inefficient, the number of Christian teachers being utterly inadequate, the class-books, specially those published by the Christian Vernacular Education Society, being full of such contemptuous allusions to idolatry and direct statements of Christian doctrine as would irritate and not attract; and (3) that the 'pearls' are so constantly 'cast before swine,' whether in class-books, or in learning Christian hymns, or in prayers before school, as to hinder conversion and substitute intellectual knowledge for faith. The general result is stated to be—(1) failure of schools as a Missionary agency; (2) injury to more direct Mission work, such as training of catechists, &c., owing to the engrossing character of the school-work; and (3) hindrance to the Missionaries in obtaining a real knowledge of native languages and character. General Tremenheere would leave to Government the main secular education, and concentrate attention, so far as education is concerned, on boarding schools for Christian children, and schools for training catechists and teachers. This, the second, chapter is the most important part of the pamphlet.

General Tremenheere's main contention is so sound, that we regret that he should weaken it by statements which are exaggerated or open to question. That Government schools are the more efficient—naturally enough, considering the resources at their command—that the *ḥṭoc* of mixed Mission schools is contaminating to Christian children, that the agencies for giving religious instruction are inefficient, the teachers inadequate, the class-books open to grave objection, the Divine mysteries far too much exposed to the gaze of unsanctified heathen, that Mission schools have been disappointing as a Missionary agency, and that every care should be taken to promote boarding schools for Christian children and schools for training catechists and teachers—all this is unquestionably true, and might be copiously illustrated. But the pamphlet is calculated to produce other impressions which are less correct. First, the whole Missionary body would repudiate the statement that Christianity is taught by heathen teachers. Some years ago this was the case to a certain extent; but the state of things is now vastly improved, and it must be remembered that, in addition to the ordinary Christian teachers of the school, the Missionaries, catechists, and readers—as in England the parochial clergy—are available for religious instruction, and the inference which the reader draws from General Tremenheere's statements respecting Punjab Mission schools is not borne out by facts. Secondly, the attack on the Christian Vernacular Education Society is too unqualified. Their training institution for teachers at Amritsur, to which allusion is made, is under a consistent member of the Church of England, has already led to some conversions, and is doing a useful work even although 'the students are mostly heathen or Mohammedan.' Moreover, Dr.

Murdoch, the Society's principal agent in India, has done good service by obtaining the withdrawal of some obnoxious and immoral books from Government schools. Thirdly, the statement that Missionaries 'rarely become thoroughly conversant with the native languages, . . . make little attempt and utterly fail to understand the native character,' though true of some, is far too strong and unqualified to be accepted as generally true of the present day, and an extract from the *Calcutta Review* of 1858 is not enough to support so sweeping and, we believe, unfair a denunciation of the Missionary body of 1876. Fourthly, it must be borne in mind that by far the greater portion of the money spent on Mission schools is raised in India for this special purpose. Nor can we assume that it would be equally available for other purposes. The home expenditure on these schools is comparatively small, so that it would be unjust for subscribers to the Societies to urge that their money given for evangelizing the heathen had been otherwise disposed of. Lastly, people in India say that while General Tremenhoe's pamphlet will do great good if it tends to produce a healthy public opinion in England and India upon this important question, it will only do harm if it induces the Societies to interfere too hastily with their Missionaries in India. They tell us also that there has been in the past ten years a marked progress in the system of working Missions, and that already a large number of Missionaries agree substantially with the tenor of this pamphlet. No doubt it is easier to lay down principles in England than to carry them out in India. We thank General Tremenhoe for his timely publication, all the more, perhaps, because he is a pioneer in a reform which will have to be a work of time.

Address of Thanks to DR. VON DÖLLINGER and the other Promoters of the Bonn Conference, 1875, from Clergy and Lay Communicants in Communion with the Church of England. Clerical and Selected Lay Signatures. (London: Stanford, 1876.)

We mention this pamphlet to our readers as one which they will like to procure and to preserve as a document. The Address was signed by 3,800 Priests and Deacons, of whom 3,612 are English, 105 Irish, 38 Scotch, 44 Indian, and 1 from the United States, as well as by 38 Bishops. The Lay Communicants who have signed are 4,170, and the list consists mainly of names sent in by various clergymen who found time to invite signatures.

Twelve Months in Madagascar. By JOSEPH MULLENS, D.D., Foreign Secretary of the London Missionary Society. (London: Nisbet.)

DR. MULLENS went to Madagascar on a tour of inspection. He went as part of a deputation from the London Missionary Society to see how their Madagascar Missions were going on. Returning home, he very naturally wrote a book in which he records his experiences. These may be roughly classed under three heads — missionary, geographical, picturesque. There is some real value about the geographical portion, an immense quantity of rose-colour rather

thickly laid on in the picturesque portion ; while as to the Missionary department we have had the amusement of seeing his reports on the state of the London Missionary Society's Missions rather freely handled in the local *Madagascar Magazine*, printed at the London Missionary Society's press in Antananarivo itself. Being inspected does not seem to conduce to self-complacency quite so much as the process of inspecting other people. But the oddest thing is to see how, when your opponents fall out, they manage to let slip uncomfortable truths.

Everybody knows how the Dissenting organisation, the London Missionary Society, has opposed *our* sending any Church Mission to Madagascar, on the score that the island was too small, and the population too few, to give scope for Church and Dissent. Well, the local critics having evidently some little quarrel with Dr. Mullens, and being ready to pounce upon inaccuracies, fall foul of the home estimate of population as being too low and altogether guess-work. And they give, as an example, that he 'confidently sets down as containing 500,000 people, neither more nor less,' a country of a thousand miles long, through which he passed once only, and that by an unfrequented route. We beg to make our polite acknowledgments to the London Missionary Society's *Madagascar Magazine* for its obliging demolition of the argument from population which their English representatives had used to denounce the *intrusion* (?) of the Church into their Dissenting preserve.

The Person and Work of the Holy Ghost, a Doctrinal Treatise. By the Rev. W. H. HUTCHINGS, M.A., Sub-Warden of the House of Mercy, Clewer. Second Edition. (Masters and Co.)

READERS of the first edition of Mr. Hutchings' valuable little work will welcome this new and improved edition. From a course of lectures it has become a treatise ; another hundred pages have been added to it ; and the original signs of a temporary purpose having been removed, we may hope that it will become of permanent use to the Church. Chapter ii. is suggestive and striking : '*The Angels' sin was the sin against the Holy Ghost.*'

The Judgment of Jerusalem, Predicted in Scripture, Fulfilled in History. By the Rev. Dr. PATTON, of New York. (Religious Tract Society.)

HERE is a specially good little book. The earlier pages give a very clear and full description of the Temple ; whilst Chapters vi.-ix., occupying a hundred pages, record the military operations of the Romans, the resistance of the Jews, and the miserable event of the siege, with much graphic power. The author has compiled details with great care ; and his little book is, for popular purposes, a monograph of the whole subject. The woodcuts are unusually good.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

The Life and Letters of Lord Macaulay. By his Nephew,
GEORGE OTTO TREVELYAN, M.P. (Longmans.)

As it is quite impossible in a short notice to distribute properly the praise and blame which a book like this demands, it seems best to take the course of stating that the many pleasant things which are to be said of Lord Macaulay are here omitted for want of space. There is no fear but that the *Life* of the most popular writer of our times must elicit, as it is eliciting, pages on pages of laudation. A thoroughly readable account of such a man is of itself a great boon; and we should be truly glad if we might indulge in many a genial paragraph in praise of the literary style, the surpassing industry, the great gift of memory, the poetical talent, the oratorical powers, the love of children, the devotion to his family, the simple tastes of this remarkable man. All this must be 'taken as read.' It will be more useful to our readers if we employ the small space at our disposal in pointing out the failure of Lord Macaulay to attain the end which he set before himself, and some of the causes of that failure.

We cannot agree with those who think that, in spite of Macaulay's inaccuracies, his historical works will live. The ambition of his life, as many passages in this book prove, was to produce something which would be to the English-speaking race what the great works of antiquity were to Greece and Rome. It is indeed one of his chief merits that he set before himself such very high standards of literary excellence, and spent such extraordinary pains in perfecting his work. Yet in not half-a-dozen or a score, but in hundreds of instances, his *Historical Essays* and his *History of England* have been convicted of such gross and glaring errors that no one can imagine they will hold their ground for any length of time. No school or college which values the success of its pupils, to say nothing of the formation of their historical habits, no Board of Studies at a University, no really well-informed parent, can ever think of recommending these books except as light reading which may afford amusement. A very large margin of readers is still left no doubt. Brilliant rhetoric, gorgeous narrative, lifelike pictures, will continue to fascinate the unreflecting; and the mere partisans both in politics and religion are numerous. The Nonconformists and those who are careless about religion form a large portion of the reading world, and these will swallow a great deal for the pleasure of seeing their enemies confounded. But retribution dogs the footsteps of this audacious infraction of historical laws. When the educated classes condemn a book of this sort, unlike an allegory such as Bunyan's, which appeals to a different order of criticism, the rest are sure to follow sooner or later; fresh sensational writers jostle the old one out of the field, and the favourite of a whole generation becomes a beacon to warn rather than a light to guide. Failure does not of necessity mean failure to sell at a particular moment. Editions after

editions may enrich a family or a publisher, but a book may be a failure all the same. If it stands convicted of untruthfulness, untruthfulness persisted in by the writer after it had been pointed out again and again—and this will be the verdict of all who take the trouble to read the numerous books and pamphlets which have exposed Macaulay, productions none the less unanswerable because they have been completely swamped and lost under the pressure of his popularity—it goes down and down, till it circulates only among tradesmen and children, or perhaps among our voracious cousins in America, and then it dies.

The causes of this failure seem to start from the birth, and develop with the education of the gifted child. What might he not have been, what might he not have written, had they been different! The peculiar religionism of the father evidently disgusted and repelled the son, whose somewhat contemptuous letters to his parent might perhaps have been better omitted. The adoration of his female relatives spoilt the conscious and precocious child. He is allowed to read just what he likes, and much of it is not what a boy of fifteen should read,—witness his letter on Boccaccio's *Decameron*, which most foul and contaminating book for young people he pronounces to be 'strikingly delicate and chastised'—(i. 58). A decided 'priggishness' becomes his main characteristic, and follows him through life. Instead of to a public school where these tendencies to conceit might have been corrected, he is sent to a poor kind of private school. He develops a passion for eternal talk which looks almost like the product of a diseased brain. Through life he talks every one down, and imagines it is—perhaps it is—a proof of brilliant talent. He elects to follow literature rather than law or politics—for both of which he had great capacities—and he elevates this pursuit into a religion. In all this his admiring biographer is continually calling on us to bow down as in the presence of one whose standard of virtue and moral elevation is of the very highest character, so that if we speak at all we must speak out. When suffering great distress under a political defeat, we have a copy of touching verses, not addressed to the true Source of comfort, but to Literature as to some goddess. This is a perfectly typical instance. It is all of the earth, earthy. Fame, popularity, political victory, literary triumph, this is the be-all and end-all. We may not, we must not, consider this a true view of life, nor can we expect satisfactory moral results from it. The direct produce of this really low estimate of affairs is the conspicuous arrogance Macaulay always displayed, his refusal to correct mistakes, the disgusting cruelty which he showed in poor Montgomery's case and in so many others, the exceeding meanness of his treatment of Croker, his dubious behaviour in the case of Mr. Wallace. We have, in short, an uneasy feeling, as we read this biography, that we are not in contact with one who has the innate and thorough refinement which characterises the highest class of English society, and which also shines in the humblest life where people are penetrated to the core with Christian principle.

The most useful thing he ever did was the formation of the

Indian Code. This is a great work, especially for the time at which it was done. The establishment of competitive examinations on a sound literary basis was also largely due to him ; and though it has been carried too far since, he is not to blame for that. Some of his Essays have merit of a high order, especially those which relate to India. Wherever, in fact, he was not tempted out of the straight path by the exceeding narrowness of his political creed, he did good service ; and even where he was so led away, we cannot but be thankful for the genuine love of liberty which illuminates every page of his writings. Such talents devoted to the conservation of abuses, or the setting up of mischievous heterodoxy, would have been a portent. Comparing Macaulay with many another great writer, he shines by comparison, both in his works and in his conduct. We might be well content to compound for so high a standard as he reaches. But if we are called upon to weigh him in scales constructed for the noblest specimens of our race and for the highest products of culture, then the less we say the better ; and we honestly regret that his biographer, clever as he is, should not have had the capacity to see this. The work of a near relation is a labour of love. It may be well written, as this book undoubtedly is ; but it is seldom worth much in fixing the character of its subject. One cannot expect judicious criticism, or anything like proper shading to the picture. With all the merit of Mr. Trevelyan's work, we certainly do not get it here.

Fifty Years of my Life. By GEORGE THOMAS, Earl of Albemarle.
(Macmillan.)

No one who reads this book can be surprised at its popularity. Lord Albemarle was well advised when he consented to put together in his eighth decade the stray notes taken during different periods of his long and interesting life. Along with these he has judiciously thrown in brief extracts from his published works, which will live when the books themselves are forgotten, and he has prefixed, what is the only dull part of the book, a memoir of his family before it came over from Holland with the 'Deliverer.' Dull, however, only by comparison, for all these contributions to history have their real interest and value ; and it is much to be wished we had more of them. It is by these memoirs of great families that we may hope in time to correct many of the errors into which so-called history has fallen ; but it requires more knowledge or more labour than the present author had at his command to clothe the skeleton with flesh and blood. The rest of the book reads more like a novel than a personal narrative. It owes its fascination to the great number of incidents connected with the historical personages of the last two generations rather than to the military experiences of the fortunate young aristocrat,—for he never saw a shot fired after Waterloo, where he served as a boy,—but still more to the admirable style, which is entirely his own, and which may well challenge imitation. Its nervous, concise, and classical character contrasts most favourably with the stilted, sensational, and verbose periods of our popular writers, and surprises us in the case of an almost uneducated military

man. When, however, we ask ourselves, as it was asked in the case of Lord Collingwood, where did this man get his style? we see plainly enough that it was just that happy combination of native genius and active life, the concentration on a few books, such as Shakspeare, to which young Keppel was devoted, the contact with real men who were above talking nonsense—it is this which gives simplicity and point, truthfulness and life. Lord Albemarle had peculiar advantages, but he knew how to make use of them. His brightness, courage, and good sense made him a general favourite, and his habit of making notes was invaluable. Perhaps of all his anecdotes and reminiscences none are so interesting as those of the Princess Charlotte, with whom he might almost be said to have been brought up. Much as has been written about her, it has always seemed unlikely that the character of one who died so young would be sufficiently unfolded before this generation to enable it to understand the extraordinary feeling manifested at her death by the nation, and retained to this day by all who have passed middle life. That outburst of national anguish is now quite intelligible to all. Under the hoydenish and masculine habits of her girlhood,—she seems to have administered a good deal of strong personal discipline to her playmate,—there was a fund of good sense and a noble heart which were capable of anything under the training of the husband of her choice. Whether it would have been better for us that we should have had Leopold and Charlotte on the throne instead of King William and Queen Victoria, who shall say? We have reason to be thankful as things have turned out; but when did a nation receive, with the prospect of a long reign under George IV. before it, a more crushing blow?

Lord Albemarle does not disguise his family politics in the slightest degree, and we are not obliged to take all his geese for swans. Fox, Lord Lansdowne, Coke of Holkham, the Duke of Sussex, Moore, Rogers, the Whig coteries in general, are his standards of public virtue or private morality; but this need not offend any one. Nor does he make any secret of his having been obliged to relinquish more than one idol which he had learnt to worship under their auspices. His military education and good sense soon taught him to despise Napoleon, and he found out that the persecuted Queen Caroline was not much better than her spouse.

We ought not to close this brief notice without a word of commendation on the rapid sketches of the careers of the three first Lords Albemarle. The distinguished share of the second and third especially, in the battles of Dettingen, Fontenoy, Culloden, and the capture of Havana, throws valuable light on faded and time-worn pictures. The nation owes more of its proud position than it now knows to men like these, and it is well we should be reminded of our debt.

The Life of Pope Pius the Seventh. By MARY H. ALLIES.
(London: Burns and Oates.)

THE Pontificate of Pius VII., from 1800 to 1823, long and eventful

as it was, does not seem to us on the whole an unfortunate one. If almost one-third of it was passed in exile and imprisonment, the aged Pontiff had at Savona, as at Fontainebleau, the unanimous sympathy of men. If he had the misfortune to see the States of the Church alienated, he had also the satisfaction of receiving them back again, and of transmitting them to his successor unimpaired and without diminution. The great return wave of events which marked that the Revolution had for the time expended its force, and that the reaction was come, swept him back again into his capital, and replaced him upon his throne. And it cannot be said that this was mere good luck, or that the Pope did not, by gentleness and dignity during his misfortunes, deserve that reinstatement which, when it came at length, was so sudden and so complete. And therefore Pius VII. commands the sympathy of those who read his Life, in a very unusual degree. To see a good man struggling with irresistible force appeals strongly to people's feelings; and this was precisely the rôle which Pius was forced to play during the greater part of his Pontificate. For the power of Napoleon was as irresistible as a tornado while it lasted; and, let us add, as immoral, as selfish, as utterly oblivious of the rights of individuals to person and property, as of nations to freedom and autonomy. It follows that our assent goes entirely with the authoress throughout this volume. It has not been invariably our lot to find ourselves able to say this. Roman Catholic biographies have too often a fulsomeness of adulation with which we cannot away. The one before us is by no means exempt from this fault. Its laudation of Pius VII. is continual, excessive, and at times profane. But his misfortunes and his sufferings almost atone for this. Nothing could be worse than Napoleon's treatment of the poor old Pontiff, and the author is at no pains to disguise her condemnation of his mingled duplicity and violence; nor do we see why she should. The memoir is, as might be expected, frankly Ultramontane, and is written almost avowedly in order to exercise an influence on the present conflict in Prussia; but it would be easy, were it worth while, to show that the cases are not so much alike as she thinks. Here are some of her prognostications:

'Such were the consequences of making the Quirinal a prison in 1808. Two generations have passed, the same battle is waging: a royal locksmith has again taken possession of the Quirinal, another Emperor mocks the Vicar of Christ; and the last quarter of the century will witness the consequences of fraud and violence imitating, with the distance which becomes their several authors, the fraud and violence of Napoleon, and exercised upon one who bears the name and repeats without a blemish the constancy of Pius VII.'

Islam under the Arabs. By ROBERT DURIE OSBORN, Major in the Bengal Staff Corps. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1876.)

MAJOR OSBORN would have made the title of his book at all events intelligible, if he had written it 'The Arabs under Islam.' We are probably intended to see in it an allusion to his division of the

history of the religion of Mohammed into three periods : during the first of which the Arab race were the determining element in the development of Islam, whilst in subsequent ages other races had taken their place. He proposes to follow up the present volume by others on the Khalifate of Baghdad, and on Islam in India. This is consequently to be considered as introductory to the subject ; and whilst it has its good qualities, partakes somewhat of the lack of interest which most people will feel in the cruel, monotonous, blood-stained annals of the Ommayas and the Fatimides. The fact is, that a history of these Eastern despotisms becomes monotonous of necessity. Violence, bloodshed, treachery, sum up all that the historian has to record. The same incidents recur with wearisome iteration ; despot after despot meets the eye, indistinguishable save by name from those who precede and follow ; the whole social state, simple as it is, seems founded on a quicksand, which gives a stable support to nothing. These are some of the feelings that the perusal of Major Osborn's work induces. It was probably necessary to give a sketch of these dynasties ; we confess we should have preferred that the sketch should not have occupied so great a part of the volume.

Islam has to be looked at in two different aspects. It is a theosophy, of a very coarse and material kind doubtless ; and it is a polity, differing comparatively little from other polities which have prevailed, before and since Mohammed, in the East. Similarly Mohammed must be regarded as the successful Bedouin chief, the man who welded the scattered tribes of the Arabs into one whole, and hurled them at the world without ; and, secondly, as the founder of a new religion. In the former character he had many noble qualities. He had considerable insight into character ; the power of attaching his followers to himself ; and a certain greatness and nobility of character, which, however, never expressed itself in clemency or generosity (we think Major Osborn's estimate erroneous in this respect) towards conquered and helpless enemies. In all these qualities he was the typical Bedouin. He embodied the predominant tendencies of the race. 'The Arab,' as our author says (we think he quotes the opinion from somebody), 'is a believing rather than a religious animal.' Perhaps for *believing* we may read *credulous* ; and certainly any other race would have resented the Prophet's sudden and violent change of front at Medina, after the Flight, and when confronted with the sacred books of the Jews, from which he professed to be quoting the preposterous fables to which he gave utterance at this period. We cannot be surprised that the name chosen for them was 'believers.' In one only respect did he rise above the ethical standard common among his countrymen : he prohibited and succeeded in rooting out the crime so fearfully common among the Arabs then, as among the Hindoos to this day, of female infanticide. 'In all else,' says our author—

'he was the Bedouin Arab, and in this fact lies the secret of his success. The predominant characteristics of the ancient Arab were an almost inconceivable vainglory and self-conceit. He was never weary of contemplating and boasting of his own perfections. Muhammad was

precisely the Prophet to win such a race. The Arab gloried in his language ; Muhammad declared that it was a divine language—the decrees of God had been written in it from all eternity. The Arab gloried in the traditional practices and customs of the desert—murder, predatory war, slavery, polygamy, concubinage. Muhammad impressed upon all these usages the seal of a divine sanction. The Arab gloried in the holiness of Mekka. Muhammad affirmed it to be the single portal whereby men could enter into Paradise. In a word, he took the Arab people just as he found them, and declared all that they did to be very good and sacred from change. The fancied revelation gratified the vanity of the Arabs, but it pronounced on them a sentence of perpetual barbarism. Such as they were when the Prophet lived, such are the Arabs now. Their condition is a proof that Islam is incapable of elevating a people to a higher level.*

In truth, we must look for the causes of the sudden and portentous bound to empire which Islamism made during Mohammed's later years, less to any fancied superiority in itself, than to the intrinsic power of the race which had accepted it and made it their own. It was the hour of the Arab ; the rare period of expansion and self-utterance which comes probably to every one of the pure stocks of mankind at least once in the world-history, and for which the Bedouin had been slowly perfecting in his deserts for a thousand years. It was, we say, the superb training of the Arab race, wiry and untiring as one of their own coursers, which spread Islam over the earth ; and their domination lasted till, enfeebled by luxury and indulgence, the pith of the Arab shrank and dwindled ; and, at the fall of the Abbaside and Ommaya dynasties, another and a hardier race snatched from the decaying Arab the sceptre of empire.

So far, the success of Islam seems to arise from causes connected but remotely with religion. And, in fact, the race was nobler than its creed. Our author is never weary of enlarging upon the barren despotism and absolute unprogressiveness of the Mohammedan religion and polity. Equally during the unquestioned supremacy of the Koran in its ordinary sense, as in those later periods when the Shias attempted to allegorise it into nothingness, or the more enlightened of the Khalifs to embroider its rude precepts with the refinements arising from civilisation, it has been found to lead the human mind into a *cul-de-sac*. Nothing could come out of it ; it was a barren tree. These developments were in themselves illegitimate. They were a proof that a certain number of minds had assimilated the spirit of Islam but imperfectly ; and alien as to the Mohammedan ideal, both one movement and the other were wiped out in blood by the unthinking crowd of so-called orthodox Muslims. As our author says in a striking passage, summing up the tendencies and the intrinsic worth of this creed,—

* The Khalif was simply the executor of a law which had been fixed finally and for ever. His rule was a highly centralised despotism, which fastened with an iron grasp on the inner life as well as on the actions of men. Progress either in thought or political freedom became impossible within the sphere of his authority, because change at all was tantamount to rebellion against the written decrees of God. No seeds of a newer or

higher life were permitted to be sown; and any which chance might have wafted hither had to be destroyed before they brought forth fruit to perfection. Intellectual power, deprived of any legitimate sphere of activity, was driven perforce to feed upon the husks of casuistry, and expend itself in endless refinements and commentaries upon the law. The religious life either petrified into a lifeless formality, or lost in a self-seeking mysticism, ceased to be a factor in the ordinary commerce of humanity. During the khalifate of Mamun, an effort was made to relieve the world of the terrible incubus of a dead revelation and give some freedom to the intellect and conscience. A party which numbered the Khalif among its adherents denied that the Koran was the word of God uncreated and eternal. They affirmed it to be the composition of the Prophet only, and, as such, liable to correction and modification. But their endeavours failed to make any wide or lasting change of thought; and the orthodox Muhammadan's creed remained, as before, "stiff as a dead man's hand." This hard, inflexible rigidity it is which has rendered the Muhammadan world incapable of profiting by the experience of history and powerless to heal the ravages of storm and decay?—(p. 161.)

On the whole, then, and though it is weighted down with a mass of dreary and profitless history, we must regard this work as one of no common interest. The author analyses with much skill the philosophical foundations of his subject. We see from him the utter immobility of the Koranic religion. Formed of the rudest and coarsest elements, it stereotypes itself of set purpose; forbids all change, all advance; and, whenever it reappears as an active force upon the world stage, is found to be substantially the same as at first. But we need not go on to insist upon this subject. The ruined villages and slaughtered and outraged populations of Bulgaria and Servia will supply only too significant a commentary upon the real character of Mohammedanism and its votaries. May the warning not pass away unheeded! It may be even that worse remains behind. An outbreak of Wahabee fanaticism, which, according to Mr. F. T. Palgrave, is always more or less impending, may give the people of this generation an opportunity to know somewhat more of the real character of Mohammedanism than, in their incurious scorn of a decaying superstition, they have hitherto cared to acquire.

Historical Handbooks. By OSCAR BROWNING. (Livingtons.)

English History in the Fourteenth Century, by Charles N. Pearson, is the last of this series, which is likely to be very useful, if carried out with the same ability as Mr. Pearson brings to the work. His dealing with the reign of Edward III. is masterly, and we think there is much truth in his estimate of the characters both of the King and of the Black Prince, though the picture he draws of the latter will be disappointing to those who have loved the younger Edward as the mirror of true chivalry; whereas he was more truly the mirror of chivalry in its outward flash, without the Christian principles that alone ennobled it. No one can study the history of his battles without seeing that he was no general. At Crécy, he was only a boy, and his father was the real leader; at Poitiers and at Navaretta he had involved himself in a desperate position, whence he was

brought off triumphantly by the generalship of Sir John Chandos and the staunchness of the English. As Mr. Pearson points out, the moment when the scale turned against Edward III. was that when the Prince became Governor of Aquitaine, and showed a hard and insolent tone towards the Gascons, setting an example which was followed by all save Chandos, who was the most really great and good man of the time.

The descriptions of the state of the country, the habits and civilisation of the time, and the tone of the people, are specially good, and worth reading. Between this book and Mr. Willert's *Life of Louis XI.*, its immediate predecessor in the series, there is all the difference of the work of an historian from that of a compiler, with a bias in favour of the subject of his biography. It is an odd liking, but it seems to be that of a counsel for his client, since Mr. Willert appears to be always trying what can be said for his hero, though too often it is only that his doings were not worse than those of somebody else, or that the contemporary authority was a Burgundian, and made the worst of them. We think that in writing of short periods like these, there should be great pains taken to secure writers who have a real enthusiasm for their subject, and can throw themselves into the time, and dwell with animation on the action, and with feeling on the event, so as to set the persons before us as living beings, and this we cannot feel that Mr. Willert has done with either Lewis or Charles of Burgundy, who both lie flat on his canvas, in spite of much careful and correct study of the subject.

The days are past when readers plodded through the many-volumed history, and Hume and Smollett, Gibbon and Robertson, are chiefly used as clothing for the walls, even where a library has been inherited. There are also a large number of tolerably educated people who hardly possess any books at all, and live on what they get from the nearest railway station or circulating library. This, together with the frequent assignment of some period of history as the subject of examination of students has led to the publication of various series of monographs, each by a different hand, on some period of history in a compendious form. The little brown volumes which Messrs. Longman term *Epochs of Modern History* have reached a goodly number, though they are rather unequal in workmanship. *The Reign of Edward III.*, by the Rev. William Warburton; *The Thirty Years' War*, and the *Puritan Revolution*, by S. R. Gardiner, have struck us as the best of this series. The first of these is a carefully worked out and interesting study of that half century, which was not too much crowded with events for full detail. The other two put matters in a clear and comprehensible light. Mr. Gardiner has taken much pains with his subject, and does not adopt conventional views without looking fully into them. His view of the character and policy of James I. strikes us as particularly just and sensible. The real wisdom and sagacity of the aims of that King, founded on considerable knowledge both of history and of affairs, here meet with justice, though of course we are shown how his plans were overthrown by his

weakness in action, inability to do justice to himself, and his unhappy choice of confidants. Though Mr. Gardiner shows a better understanding of Buckingham's character than we generally meet with, and is far less inclined than most writers of the present day to condemn the whole theory of the royalist position in the next reign, he does not appreciate the cause of the Church, and has little to say for Laud; but Strafford commands his admiration to a certain degree, for his Irish administration; nor is he so determined on seeing a hero and a martyr in Eliot as not to perceive that his opposition was such as to deserve the title of factious towards the State as it was then constituted. It is a book which, without being royalist, really gives a very fair view of the struggle. Mr. Seebohm's *Era of the Reformation* is not equally successful; Luther's earlier years occupy so much of the space that the after events are squeezed in with far too little detail, and the writer has failed to make his account of the Reformation in England or France come into proportion with that of the same era in Germany. The Rev. E. Hare has undertaken the *Fall of the Stuarts, and Western Europe*, from 1678 to 1697, and seems to us to have fulfilled the task rather too much as a task, with rather the air of having read up for the purpose than of thoroughly grasping the subject. The English part is the best, but the French sketches do not satisfy us that he has made any real acquaintance with the court of Louis XIV., especially when he calls Madame de Sévigné a distinguished educationalist.

Historical Biographies. Edited by the Rev. M. CREIGHTON. (Rivingtons.)

AFTER Mr. Pearson's grave and severe judgment of the Black Prince, it is like turning back from middle age to youth to take up the *Life of Edward the Black Prince*, by Louise Creighton, where we have the graceful, generous, chivalrous Prince of Froissart, the boy who wins his spurs, the courteous captor of John of France, the avenger of the exiled Spaniard, all told with happy enthusiasm, which even declares that 'we must not blame the Black Prince too severely' for the massacre of Limoges. But we would give our children this little book, and try to get our intelligent scholars to read it, for the picture is an inspiring one, and in its way is true, in the same way that much that is really bright seen from a little way off will not bear the microscopic inspection that Mr. Pearson has given the character. If we could, we had rather let our children pore over Johnes' *Froissart*, and pick out his Black Prince for themselves; but as there is not one child in five hundred who has the opportunity, and not one in five thousand who would use it, as children are now brought up, we view this bright little narrative as a boon to them, worth far more even in moral training than the washy little tales of 'good tendency' that are lavished on them. No one can enter into the spirit of Froissart's hero, without gaining something of that sense of high honour, which, though no sufficient guide, is an admirable trainer.

The Rev. M. Creighton's *Simon de Montfort* is a more valuable book, because there is no such life of the great Earl of Leicester,

whereas biographies of the Black Prince and tales from Froissart abound. There is a great deal in this little book that has never been put together before, and which is very interesting both for its curiosity and as conducing to the understanding of that grand character. The political ballads of the time are brought in very curiously. They are mostly Latin and French, and there are some English ones, said to be the earliest in the language, reproaching Richard, King of the Romans, for his grasping spirit:

‘Richard, though thou be ever trichard,
Tricken shalt thou never more!’

It is striking to find that Mr. Creighton connects Simon's wise and thoughtful political opinions with the revival of learning, and especially of philosophical religion, by means of the orders of friars, to whom the Earl was a warm friend, and who probably were the writers of the many poems in his praise, both in his lifetime and in his honour. He was as much canonised as popular belief could effect without Papal sanction. Two hundred and twelve cures were held to have been performed at his tomb at Evesham, there was a service on his anniversary like that of any saint's day, and a hymn from it has been preserved, beginning—

‘Salve, Simon Montis Fortis,
Totius flos militiæ,
Duras pœnas passus mortis,
Protector gentis Angliæ.’

MISCELLANEOUS.

Shakspeare's Plutarch; being a Selection from the Lives in North's Plutarch which illustrate Shakspeare's Plays. Edited, with a Preface, Notes, Index of Names, and Glossarial Index, by the Rev. WALTER W. SKEAT, M.A., formerly Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge. (Macmillan and Co.)

It has long been known that Shakspeare's considerable familiarity with the persons and incidents of Greek and Roman history was due to no deep classical learning; and closer research has brought to light coincidences which leave no room for doubt that it was Plutarch's *Lives* from which he drew the raw material of fact which the flame of his genius transmuted into forms still more beautiful and lasting. Not merely Plutarch, but a particular translation of Plutarch, was further fairly capable of being identified as Shakspeare's storehouse. It was from a translation made by Sir Thomas North, founded on the French of Jacques Amyot, and first published in 1579, that Shakspeare drew. ‘It was his version and no other,’ says Mr. Skeat, ‘which Shakspeare used; it was from North, and no one else, that he imitated certain phrases, expressions, and characteristics so familiar to all readers, though very few know which those phrases are.’

Curiously enough, it seems probable that we can now identify the very copy of the work which the poet used; for there is in the Greenock Library a copy of the edition of 1612, on whose title-page is found 'Vive: . ut Vivas: . W.S.; pretiũ 18s.' in a handwriting which is said to be like Shakspeare's, and with some suggestive notes in the very *Lives* which he unquestionably used in the composition of his plays. We cannot say that the evidence is very convincing; but, such as it is, there is nothing on the other side; and people may believe it if they please.

North's Plutarch is much too voluminous a work to be reproduced entire; and what Mr. Skeat has done is to republish seven of the *Lives* which Shakspeare used, with a glossary explaining the very few obsolete words, and sundry other indices. We could, however, have wished that Mr. Skeat had given one more index, showing the parallel passages in Plutarch and the Plays. It would have been a great convenience and would have doubled the value of the book.

North's version leaves upon the mind a feeling of strength and manliness. Its vigorous, masterful English suggests that of the Authorised Version, of the *Pilgrim's Progress*, and of *Robinson Crusoe*. That which he does for the old Greeks and Romans is not so much to translate their Lives, as to transfigure their story in its essential features into the mould of his own time. The perspective of a distant age vanishes; and the far-off is brought near. Each of these life-stories, as North tells it, might have taken place in the sixteenth century itself. He evidently feels the essential humanity of his clients as fully and strongly as even Shakspeare did. All the technical terms that give an air of learned rust to a narrative have disappeared from his pages. The legions have become 'ensigns'; the *equites*, knights; the *pontifex maximus* is transformed into a bishop; the *impedimenta*, munitions of war; the soldier's helmet, a sallet; and so on. As we read we can see whence our great dramatist caught his habit of fearless transformation of local colouring and mere historical costume. Surely Sir Thomas North was a man whom, no less than his greater contemporary, one would have loved to know.

For these reasons, as well as for the incidental help to the study of Shakspeare which this volume is calculated to afford, we must welcome its appearance. With the exception we have named, it is all that could possibly be wished; and is in any case a valuable contribution to our knowledge of the sources whence the Elizabethan drama was derived. Other playwrights besides Shakspeare, there can be little doubt, drank of this 'well of English undefiled!' We believe that Clough's version of Plutarch had no more than a *succès d'estime*. We shall be glad to hear that the present volume so hits the public taste as to encourage the editor and publisher to follow it with the remaining *Lives*.

The Christian Evidence Journal for 1875. Edited by H. B. HARRIS COWPER. (Hodder and Stoughton.)

THIS useful periodical, after two years of existence, has, we believe, ceased to appear since December last. We have, therefore, only to

drop a valedictory tear upon its grave, and express our hope that the Society's valuable work may not thereby be hindered. The volume for 1875, which is before us, has undoubtedly much that is interesting and useful among its varied contents. One article, bearing the well-known initials B.H.C., has struck us especially. It is on 'The Eusebius who did teach Falsehood.' It has long been a cavil among opponents of Christianity that in the early ages the Church taught *suppressio veri*, or, in other words, that lying is lawful, like some Jesuit casuists. Such a statement was certainly current under the name of a writer named Eusebius, and, by some error, the sentiment was fastened upon Eusebius of Cæsarea, the Church historian—we do not know why, probably because he was the best known person of that name (there were at least nine such Eusebii). Mr. Harris Cowper, in the article referred to, shows good reason for thinking that it should be ascribed to Eusebius of Myndus—a distinguished heathen philosopher, and one of the tutors of the Emperor Julian. This correction of an inveterate error is worth having, and articles like this form a valuable feature in the journal. But we could wish that the writer had given the exact reference to Stobæus. His 'Εκλογαὶ and 'Αρθολόγιον are each in four long volumes, and he would have saved a few readers some trouble.

But we fear we must say that the articles, with some exceptions, are not of a popular kind, and want a little more of the *crustula blandi doctoris*.

The American Church Review. (New York : No. 7, Cooper Union. London : Trübner and Co.)

THE American Church may be congratulated on having an organ so ably conducted, and with so many good points about it, as the one before us. It is, perhaps, not quite fair to judge as to the permanent tendencies of a Magazine by the contents of a single number. If we should do so, we might say that it is strong in the department of archaeology and of practical Church politics, but decidedly weak in theology proper. An excellent article on Latin Hymnody is contributed by Mr. John Anketell, of New York ; but he has fallen into some errors. Bede was born, not at Durham, but somewhere in the neighbourhood of Wearmouth ; not in 673, but in 672 ; and his monastery was at Jarrow, not Yarrow. He is probably wrong in ascribing the version of ' *Veni Creator* ' which we have in the Ordinal to Bishop Cosin, though he may have touched it here and there. Nor are we so satisfied as he seems to be that the hymn did not come from the pen of Charlemagne, to whom we think he has done injustice, and who is certainly not adequately characterised as ' licentious and tyrannical.' Mr. C. R. Hale's detailed proposal to make of the majestic Mozarabic Liturgy once more a living rite, for the use of the Old Catholics in Mexico, is interesting, if somewhat speculative. Again, the articles bearing on the practical work of the Church seem to be universally thoughtful and weighty. ' Congregationalism in the Church,' by Bishop Spalding, shows the existence of a movement towards accepting the diocese instead of the congre-

gation, as the unit of Church organisation : a movement most necessary to the Church's progress ; and, furthermore, to realise that unity outwardly by the provision of cathedrals. The Hon. Murray Hoffman, in '*Bishops Elect*,' has his say about the Illinois trouble, of which we have clearly not heard the last.

The theological element is weak. There is a gossiping sort of dissertation about 'The Superscription on the Cross,' the writer of which states that 'each Evangelist is very careful to give the whole of the title,' which is just what each Evangelist is *not*. The leading article, 'Theses on the Union to the Last Adam,' is not in the form of theses, and it strikes us as utterly wild ; and some of its expressions are dangerously near heresy.

The shorter notices appear to us better done than anything else.

Common-Sense Truths for Cottage Homes. By FORBES WINSLOW, M.A., Vicar of Epping. (London : J. T. Hayes.)

MR. FORBES WINSLOW knows how to write forcible English, and that is an accomplishment not so common as people think. There is nothing very *recondite* in the matter of his little book—common, ordinary truths, of which most people, even the dullest, have a *sensation* in the back of their heads, but cannot formulate them, or do not know how to realise them to themselves. Now, Mr. Forbes Winslow knows how to put these everyday, homely truths in bright and telling forms. His arrows would, we imagine, *strike*, and *stick* in the mind. The chapter, *e.g.*, entitled 'The Helping Hand' ought to be reprinted as a halfpenny tract, and circulated by tens of thousands among workmen. We can recommend the little volume to the clergy for parish use.

The Pilgrims of the Passion. (Bristol : W. Chatterton Dix. London : J. Hodges.)

In this little *brochure* we have the old figure of the earthly pilgrimage worked up into a pleasing and devout allegory, containing deep and essential truths expressed in such simple language as will make it very fit for distribution.

The Story of the Cross, with accompanying Tune. The words by the late Rev. EDWARD MONRO, M.A. ; the music arranged by JOHN BIDEN, Organist of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, Northampton. (Northampton : Biden.)

A VERY devotional and touching hymn, wedded to one of the simplest possible melodies, plainly yet effectively harmonised. It will, no doubt, be found of service in stimulating the devotion of congregations during Passiontide.